JULY 1952 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—The Body of the Flesh—The Body of the Cross—The Body of the Resurrection—What has this Somatology to Do With Us?—Bible Revision—Healing of the Gergesene Demoniac—The People to Whom We Witness . . . 293

II. THE EPISTOLARY FORM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Emeritus Professor R. L. Archer, M.A., D.Litt., U.C.N.W., Bangor 296

III. LITERATURE 299

IV. PREACHING AND THE TECHNIQUES OF CONTEMPORARY CULTURE. By Professor W. Fraser Mitchell, Birmingham 305

V. RECENTLY PUBLISHED FRAGMENTS OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. By Professor Bruce M. Metzger, Ph.D., D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary . . 309

VI. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 312
2. The Christian Year 313

VII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. The Church and the Ministry. By Professor John McKenzie, M.A., D.D., Edinburgh . 321
2. The Cleansing of the Temple. By the Reverend Canon F. A. Cooke, M.A., Audenshaw, Manchester 321
3. A Simple Solution of Nehemiah iv. 23. שִׁלְחוֹ מַיִם. By the Reverend H. J. Warner, B.D., Poole, Dorset 322

VIII. ENTRE NOUS—Religious Education: Teaching the Miracle Stories of the Bible—Servants of the Entrusted Word 322

VOLUME LXIII. No. 10

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH

EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

In Thirteen Handsome Volumes

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS

Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS

Vol.	I. A—Art	Vol.	VII. Hymns—Liberty
,,	II. Arthur—Bunyan	,,	VIII. Life—Mulla
,,	III. Burial—Confessions	,,	IX. Mundas—Phrygians
,,	IV. Confirmation—Drama	,,	X. Picts—Sacraments
,,	V. Dravidians—Fichte	,,	XI. Sacrifice—Sudra
,,	VI. Fiction—Hyksos	,,	XII. Suffering—Zwingli

INDEX VOL.—General Index
Index of Foreign Words
Index of Scripture Passages
List of Authors, with their Contributions

Price per Volume: In Half Leather - - - 70s.
In Cloth - - - - - 50s. net.

The wisdom of the ages on all questions—ethical, social, religious, economic and political—is gathered together in this great work. Philosophy, Psychology and Theology are all fully represented. Persons and places that have contributed to the history of religion and morals are also described. Here is to be found what the great scholars of the world have been able to learn about all the nations as they developed or decayed, and of nations now going through these processes.

Problems growing out of the present world-wide restlessness cannot be solved by Twentieth-Century wisdom alone. Their roots were planted in the past. They are not new problems. They have confronted the people of former ages, and can only be solved by applying the lessons learned of old.

'For a generation which has to face the problems of a world disposed to challenge all authority, and of a Church conscious of its inability to concentrate its forces for its world-wide task, the large outlook of these volumes is valuable beyond all telling.'—*Baptist Times.*

'A remarkable achievement.'—*Guardian.*

'Any possessor of the Encyclopædia is armed at all points on every subject with which the theologian is concerned.'—*Christian World.*

'The more the Encyclopædia is used, the more it is valued.'—*Hibbert Journal.*

Obtainable from any bookseller. Postage additional.

SCRIBNERS
NEW YORK

T. & T. CLARK
EDINBURGH

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.*

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

We are tempted to begin with a bad pun and say that those who like a theology with some 'body' in it should read No. 5 of the S.C.M. Press's 'Studies in Biblical Theology.' For its title is *The Body*,[1] and the thesis of its author, Dr. J. A. T. Robinson of Cambridge, is that the concept of the body supplies the key to Paul's thought.

Most of us know that Paul uses the word 'body' frequently. (For example, it occurs no fewer than forty-five times in 1 Corinthians, and its absence from the Pastorals is a minor argument against their Pauline authorship.) But have we realized how much theology is tied up with it? Joining ingenuity to erudition, Dr. Robinson has produced a little theology of Paul in terms of 'the Body.' Starting with 'the Body of the Flesh,' he goes on to 'the Body of the Cross,' and ends with 'the Body of the Resurrection.' In Paul's mind each of these themes is intimately connected. From the body of the flesh Christ has redeemed us. It is by the body of the Cross that He has done it. And it is into the Body of the Resurrection, which is the Church, that we are redeemed. If Dr. Robinson is right—and his essay is quite a notable contribution to New Testament theology—future treatises on the Apostle's theology will have to find a place for Pauline 'Somatology.'

Let us try to outline the three stages of his argument.

Sarx and *soma*, 'flesh' and 'body,' are key and cognate terms in Paul. In many ways they overlap and correspond. If the 'flesh' denotes external and physical existence, describes man in his 'worldliness,' and sometimes is equivalent to a personal pronoun, so it is with the word 'body.' But the 'flesh' has sinister connotations not shared by the 'body.' It can also mean man in contrast with God—man as frail and mortal—and man in his apostasy from God, so that to live 'according to the flesh' is the way of sin and death. Now, though Paul can speak of 'the body of sin' and 'this body of death,' knowing that as linked with the 'flesh' it shares its corruption, he also sees in the 'body' the vehicle of resurrection and life. 'While *sarx* stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, in his distance from God, *soma* stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, as made for God.' Paul promises no resurrection for the flesh; he proclaims it for the body. For 'the body is for the Lord,' and 'the Lord is for the body.' The purpose of Christ's coming was its redeeming.

So, by a natural transition, we turn to consider 'the body of the Cross.'

Into the body of the old world of sin and death came Christ, in a body of flesh, to redeem it. Consider the human situation, as Paul sees it. Man, according to the Apostle, is trebly enslaved. He is in bondage to the powers of death, of sin, which is death's accomplice, and of the Law, which is sin's instrument. This is the thraldom to which every son of Adam is heir. But, thanks be to God,

> A second Adam to the fight
> And to the rescue came.

Into this human situation came the Redeemer bringing a redemption which has three phases. First, Christ completely identified Himself (yet without sin) with our body of flesh in its fallen state; taking 'the form of a servant and becoming obedient unto death,' coming 'in the likeness of flesh of sin,' and 'being born under the Law.' Second, by His death He 'died out on' evil, triumphing over the forces of death in the Cross, 'becoming sin for us,' and dying to 'redeem us from the curse of the Law.' Third, the virtue of what Christ did in His flesh-body becomes ours through baptism. With Christ we who were slaves to the flesh die to it, and in union with Him rise into newness of life.

This brings us to the third stage in Dr. Robinson's essay—'the Body of the Resurrection.' And here the reader begins to get into deep water through the very complexity of the argument. For under this head Dr. Robinson includes the glorified body of Christ, His mystical Body and His Eucharistic Body as well as the Christian's hope of the resurrection and renewal of his own body. It is all very mystifying as well as mystical; but we

[1] 7s. net.

gather that Paul's description of the Church as the Body of Christ is far more than a metaphor, that Paul probably derived his description from the Eucharistic Loaf, and that Christians are the risen organism of Christ's person in all its concrete reality. So Paul can pass easily from the Eucharist to the Ecclesia, and speak of Christ not as one but as many persons cohering in Him as the branches cohere in the tree.

Some will have difficulty in following Dr. Robinson when he comes to consider the Christian's 'spiritual body' in relation to his doctrine of the Body of Christ. Here he insists that Paul never thinks of the Christian's resurrection body in an individualistic way. The carrier of the future glory is not the individual but the Church. It is as we are incorporated into the Body of Christ—a process begun at baptism and to be consummated at the Parousia—that we rejoice in hope of the glory of God. In fine, the Christian hope of resurrection is fundamentally social.

We have said enough to show the suggestiveness of Dr. Robinson's treatment of his theme: 'It is from the body of sin and death that we are delivered; it is through the body of Christ on the Cross that we are saved; it is into His Body the Church that we are incorporated; it is by His body in the Eucharist that this Community is sustained; it is in our body that its new life has to be manifested; it is to a resurrection of this body to the likeness of His glorious body that we are destined.'

What has all this 'somatology' to do with us? We live in the era of mass man. The age of individualism is past, and with it the aim of social salvation as independence (economic, political, and religious) from responsibility to the authority of the group. Not independence but interdependence is the order of our day. Neutrality and isolationism are well-nigh impossible. If we are to survive, it must be as 'members of one another.' But the eclipse of the individual's powers to think and act and the dominance of socialized man can be fraught with great peril—the peril of totalitarian slavery. If it is the task of Christians to prevent this happening, may we not learn from Paul's doctrine of the Body the true nature of community? May we not discover from his insights how modern man may win social salvation not by trying to assert his independence in defiance of the giant State but by becoming a person 'who freely chooses interdependence because his nature is to be made for others, rather than one who is engulfed in it because the pressures of his age demand it?'

Thus Dr. Robinson phrases the relevance of his study for our time. There is truth in it, but one cannot help wondering if so to state it is not to play into the hands of the Marxists.

In the current quarterlies there are, as always, several articles of very considerable interest. In *The Modern Churchman* there is an article by Dr. Roderic Dunkerley on 'Bible Revision,' which sets forth an unusual but a by no means unjustified point of view. Dr. Dunkerley begins with a consideration of the comparative failure of the Revised Version, which was characterized by a famous Dean as 'the most astonishing as well as the most calamitous literary blunder of the age.' The Revised Version began under a handicap because it was made far too late. The Authorised Version was never meant to be a definitive and binding version of the Scriptures; the natural thing would have been to produce revisions, which would take account of changing speech and advancing scholarship, every fifty or a hundred years. But in point of fact the Authorised Version had so long held the field that any new version began under a handicap. That handicap was accentuated by the methods of the revisers. When the project was mooted it was suggested that there would be a maximum number of changes averaging at the most one per verse. In point of fact there were thirty-six thousand changes in the New Testament which is four and a half per verse. Many well-loved verses were omitted or doubt was cast on their authenticity by critical notes in the margin because they did not appear in the earliest manuscripts. Two outstanding examples are the questioning of Lk 23^{34} and the omission in Lk 9^{54-56}. Dr. Dunkerley makes an interesting point when he says that in point of fact many of the alterations in the later manuscripts are in fact corrections. Such, for instance, is the substitution of 'the prophets' for 'Isaiah' in Mk 1^{2}. Why go back to that which is older but incorrect? Dr. Dunkerley holds that there has been a tendency to make a fetish of the text. He holds that the occasions on which the *textus receptus* provides any peril to Christian faith and practice are negligible. Certainly, he holds, there should be a scholars' text; but for ordinary everyday devotional purposes the accepted text is more than adequate. 'There are points of similarity between the Bible and a Cathedral. Both are works of beauty given to us by the Spirit of God through the hands and minds of many faithful servants through many long years. . . . We do not chip off fragments of the cathedral here and there because they were added later than some particular date. And why should we do such a thing in the case of the Bible?' Here is a challenge to consider when accuracy becomes pedantic accuracy which is more of a hindrance than a help.

In *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* there is a very interesting article, by the Rev. Harry Belshaw, entitled 'Swine, Sound, and Sanity,' on the healing of the Gergesene demoniac. There is no doubt of the difficulty of this miracle. The commonest view is that the shout of the healed demoniac scared the swine and that their rush into the sea was the very definite ocular proof the man needed before he could believe that the demons had really left him. When the man was asked his name he answered 'Legion.' Dr. Weatherhead has already suggested that the reason for that is that at some time this man had witnessed some dreadful act of cruelty wrought by a Roman Legion, perhaps the Massacre of the Innocents, and that that scene had left a permanent wound on his mind that drove him mad. Now Mr. Belshaw brings a quite new theory to this miracle. The man was in fetters. Who imprisoned him? Mr. Belshaw postulates an imprisonment by the Roman power. In that imprisonment the poor madman was dreadfully and terribly treated. So badly was he treated, as a madman might well be, that he cries out 'Torment me not' at the sight of strangers. The cruelty of a Roman Legion has scarred his mind. If that be so, what part did the swine play in the cure? Mr. Belshaw suggests that it was not the *sight* but the *sound* of the stampeding swine which was so important. 'Chained in captivity, an object of fear and derision, subject to the harsh treatment of the soldiers, lying in the dark listening to shouted commands, the clang of arms, the sound of many feet clattering on hard pavements, the insistent noise of marching feet filling his cell with a confused uproar! He did not *see* the Legion: he *heard* it.' That sound echoed and re-echoed in his tortured brain, bringing back its terrible associations. Now he met with gentleness and understanding. 'Its end came when the pigs began running (startled we know not how) and the noise of their running feet filled the air, mingled with those feet that rushed in incessant confusion in his head, until, going farther and farther away, the uproar grew fainter . . . and stopped. The tumult of sound was ended.' The cure was complete. This is certainly a vivid and intelligible picture. No one would claim that it solves all the difficulties but it does present a line of thought that deserves to be considered.

In *The Congregational Quarterly* there is a penetrating analysis of the climate of this present age. It is entitled 'The People to Whom We Witness,' and the writer is Mr. Glynmor John. This is an age of magnificent scientific discovery and yet an age when 'man is becoming more and more afraid of his growing powers.' It is an age of cynicism. There is a distrust of the churches; there is a belief that 'it is of the real nature of religion to be conservative and intellectually timid.' Further, the dreams of a new world have 'lost their glow.' Yet beneath this cynicism there is the basic need for 'mutual esteem and security.' Here Mr. John has a fine thought. 'I think,' he writes, 'sometimes that in their scarcely veiled hostility to the Gospel and the Church of Jesus Christ they are really subjecting us to a test, to make sure that here is a love which is real and reliable. If so, it is a child's reaction, but it is the reaction of a child cruelly testing his mother because he does not feel sure of the love for which he most deeply craves.' If that be so this very cynical hostility is a challenge and an invitation.

In this machine age there is a necessary depersonalization of people; and yet, curiously enough, this has not produced a feeling of interdependence; it has rather produced a selfish individualism. There is also 'an egalitarianism that "claws-down."' It was never more difficult for a man to be in any sense different from his fellows.

This is an age which is disinterested in God. Therefore, it is 'largely an illiterate age, religiously speaking.' That is why, quite unjustly, it grumbles about religious terminology. 'Vocabulary is no stumbling block when interest is alive.' A boy will talk of thermionic valves and a man will be an expert in permutations! People have 'no religious vocabulary because they are not interested in religious experience.'

Into this age's mind there has percolated the idea of an ordered universe based on the scientific temper of the age. This has caused hostility to religion first, because religion has been churlish in its attitude to science and, second, because the idea of God and arbitrariness have too often gone together. We need a real attempt to rethink and restate the doctrine of providence. The line of thought that Mr. John suggests is that 'progress, scientific and technical, must be God's intention.' We must think out the conception of a God 'whose sole design is for the enhancement of man's life.'

In *The Hibbert Journal* Professor Geddes Macgregor writes on 'The Sceptical Implicate of Religious Belief.' It is charged against the religious mind that it is notoriously eager to believe. In point of fact many of the great religious figures wanted to do anything but believe and were in the end forced to against their will. Paradoxically the Christian believes in a mystery about many things of which he is quite uncertain. It is the unbeliever who dogmatically denies things. 'When I say, "I believe there is a cat upstairs," I mean, of course, that I have a very strong opinion that there is, and this is an opinion which can

easily be verified by empirical observation. When I say, " I believe in the resurrection of the body," not only is my belief not of the nature of a very strong opinion, whatever else it may be, but it is a belief that I cannot by any means empirically verify. . . . I am not, in the nature of the case, quite sure about every aspect of that which I affirm ; but I claim to be sure of what it is that I deny, namely the dogmatism of those who in repudiating all such belief insist that there is no mystery there at all.' Dr. Geddes MACGREGOR holds that just because the Christian believes in things which are mysteries there are many things of which he cannot be sure ; the one thing of which he is sure is that he does not deny the existence of the mystery. The real dogmatist is the rationalist and the unbeliever who does dogmatically deny that there is any mystery there. This is an article so closely wrought and so epigrammatically expressed that it must be read in full. It is an important article, because it pleads for the humility in which lies the possibility of all true knowledge and it warns against the dogmatism which will not admit that there is anything to learn.

The Epistolary Form in the New Testament

BY EMERITUS PROFESSOR R. L. ARCHER, M.A., D.LITT., U.C.N.W., BANGOR

JÉRÔME CARCOPINO'S book on Cicero's letters, written in French in 1947 and translated into English in 1951, being in effect a history of ' Epistles ' as a branch of literature, though he himself is probably not interested in Christian literature, has a most important bearing on the ' Letters ' in the New Testament which all belong to the same period.

It must be made clear at the start that the contentions which led Carcopino to write the book and which have roused so many classical enthusiasts to positive anger are quite irrelevant to the Biblical question. These contentions, (1) that Cicero's Letters were published by his enemies to show him up, and (2) that they do in fact prove him to have been not only incapable as a statesman but despicable as a man, are matters of inference. They may be totally rejected, but do not affect the two matters of fact which follow.

The two matters of fact stated by Carcopino, and the principle which it will be easy to prove, that the Christians of the vital years which we are considering adopted the two newest genres of literature, the epistle and the biography, carry us the whole way.

The first of these facts is that, during the principates of Augustus and Tiberius, Cicero was under a cloud ; no one dared openly to praise him as a man, however much they might praise his writings for their style, and no one dared to discuss his letters. Then came Claudius, an admirer of Cicero, who changed all this, and Cicero's letters looked as if they would become, as they subsequently did, the models for all letters.

But the second fact is that now came an intervention. Seneca, writing in the principate of Nero, declared that a collection of letters dealing with private affairs or purely temporary political situations was banal and beneath the dignity of literature, and that the right kind of collection of letters was one which set forth a philosophy, and such a collection he proceeded to write. This view was doubtless accepted as long as Seneca was ' the power behind the throne,' but it soon gave way to the pro-Ciceronian view.

In order to show that these facts have a bearing on the ' Epistles ' of the New Testament, it is necessary to show that the Christians of the period adopted almost exclusively the two newest genres of literature, biography and the letter. The only exception in the Canon is Acts, which is history. The proof is a mere matter of making a list. But, in the case of the Gospels, which are biographies, it becomes striking when we contrast their biographical form with the probable Q, which presumably originated in Aramaic, and was based on the form of the longer prophetic books of the Old Testament, which mainly consisted of the prophet's utterances, but described his call, and gave a few biographical facts which were necessary to explain the occasion on which certain utterances were made. The Gentile churches demanded a biography and the Gospel according to Mark was accordingly written independently of Q, while Luke worked Q into a biography. Apart from the Gospels and Acts, all the rest of the New Testament consists either of real letters or of documents thrown into epistolary form, even when meant for general circulation. We might have expected sermons to appear in the newest

pagan genre as speeches, and a treatise on Christian ethics (such as what we call the 'Epistle' of James) as a philosophical treatise like Cicero's *De Officiis*; but no! All appear in the epistolary form, and the only reason which can be suggested is that it was something new. Christianity was determined to present itself as something Greek; it must run no risk of being regarded as one of the Oriental superstitions with which the Orontes was infecting the Tiber. To do this, it sought to be absolutely 'up-to-date.'

To connect the 'Epistles' of the New Testament with the history of letters as a literary form in Latin, as it is traced by Carcopino, dates are needed, both as regards the publication of St. Paul's letters (which really are letters) as a collection, and as regards the use of the epistolary form for other writings, which are not really letters.

The only exact date which we possess is A.D. 140, when Marcion came to Rome. He recognized only ten Pauline Epistles and St. Luke's Gospel. Later Christian tradition, as is well known, treated his rejection of the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews as well as all non-Pauline Epistles and the other Gospels as a purely heretical invention, made in order to set aside everything which could be utilized against his own views. But, as regards the ten-letter Pauline Canon, he agrees so well with modern criticism as to suggest that he had a knowledge of a period when ten Epistles only were recognized at Rome; otherwise it is hard to see why he did not carry his rejections further. The dates favour such a conclusion. The Pastorals cannot be much later than A.D. 100, since they are quoted by Ignatius, nor earlier than A.D. 90 in view of the ecclesiastical organization which they imply. Men of forty or fifty could therefore remember a time in their youth or childhood when they were unknown. And Hebrews was not recognized as Pauline at Rome.

But the ten-letter Canon includes the Epistle to Philemon. The inclusion of a private letter like this implies the theory that even the private letters of a man whose letters are worth publishing at all should be included; and it is hard to believe that the original publication of Paul's letters was based on such a theory and not on an evangelistic motive. Since the Flavian period sees other Christian writings assuming epistolary form, the principate of Nero seems to be marked as the time when this collection of real letters was published. Thus it becomes probable that it followed on Seneca's thesis that a worthy collection of letters was one which set forth a philosophy and on Seneca's own example of such a collection: a publication of a set of St. Paul's letters would be the Christian way of carrying out Seneca's thesis.

It is, however, necessary to show that the Pauline letters were published from the sender's end, that is at Rome, not collected from the receivers' ends as was at one time thought. This is easily shown; how otherwise could several letters come to be united as 'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians,' and how did the letter which in our Bibles appears as the last chapter of Romans get attached to that Epistle? Clearly the Apostle kept for his own use, and somewhat untidily if we might dare to say so, copies or in some cases partial copies of his letters, which we may presume were used later to embody the genuinely Pauline passages in the Pastorals, and probably included the copy of the non-Pauline Epistle to the Hebrews (from which the canonical publication was subsequently taken) which he kept because it had a distinct influence on his own theology. Incidentally we may remark that the inclusion of Ephesians by Marcion is evidence that, whoever actually wrote it, it was despatched with Paul's approval, as it is implied that no one knew of a time when it was not included in the Pauline collection.

The inclusion of the short private letter to Philemon in the collection implies that already the reversion had taken place to the Ciceronian tradition and that it was now the orthodox literary opinion that all the available letters of a great letter-writer should be published, whether they dealt with public and important or with private and unimportant matters. It belongs therefore to the same Flavian period as the earlier of the non-Pauline 'Epistles.'

Of these non-Pauline 'Epistles' 2 and 3 John are genuine letters; indeed 3 John may be regarded as another instance of carrying out the principle on which Philemon was published. Of the rest, 1 Peter, if it is what it professes to be, is hardly a letter but a manifesto, as it specifies an area of numerous provinces to which it is addressed; in style it is so Pauline as to suggest that Silvanus (Silas, Paul's companion) was much more than the copyist ($v.^{12}$) but substantially the author. The 'Epistle' of James is clearly the work of a 'didascalos' (3^{1}), whose function was not to preach to non-Christians but to teach Christian ethics to those who were already believers, and its address to 'the twelve tribes in dispersion' means, in Christian language, all persons who are already Christians. The Apocalypse of John the prophet, stripped of the preface as to authorship, takes the form of a letter by 'John to the seven churches which are in Asia' (1^{4}) and ends like a letter (22^{21}). A later writing, 'The Epistle of Jude,' is a 'tract for the times': modern criticism is inclined to think that the original heading was 'Judas (son)

of James, and servant of Jesus Christ,' which was changed in post-Marcionite times into its present form to make it appear to be the work of an apostle. The use of the epistolary form lasted to the end of the century and included the pseudepigraphic '2 Peter' and the Pastorals, which included some genuine Pauline fragments.

The history of the Canon after Marcion is a part of higher criticism which has for some time been well established. He rejected all Epistles which were not the work of an apostle, though accepting as his only Gospel the work of the non-apostolic Luke. The reaction of the Church was to attribute to apostles 'epistles' which had won their way into its services by their merit. James was identified with 'the brother of the Lord,' and Jude with another brother, John the prophet with the son of Zebedee, as was John 'the elder,' while eventually the 'Epistle to the Hebrews' was attributed to St. Paul.

Carcopino's account of the development of the epistolary form in secular literature, read in the light of the Christian desire to use only the newest literary genres, gives us then a new and supremely interesting picture of Christian activity from the principate of Nero till the end of the century. The Apostles and most of the eye-witnesses were dead. The weight which was given to oral preaching by the constant statements 'This I saw' or 'This so-and-so saw' was gone. Christian propaganda turned from the oral to the written word. Paul's Epistles were first published as a series to fulfil the functions of Seneca's philosophic collection. Then, along with the publication of Mark's Gospel, probably a little before the Fall of Jerusalem, and Luke's a little after that event (Matthew's originated in the East) came the issuing in epistolary form of the best of the work of the second, that is of the contemporary generation. Except for the Acts of the Apostles, the two forms, the biographical and the epistolary, were alone used. So far as Rome was concerned there were several aims. The first and most obvious was to throw into a permanent form the witness of the first generation. The second was to produce evidence from the Old Testament that the life of the Messiah had been accomplished by Jesus exactly as declared therein: since the first moment, when the Resurrection had appeared as sufficient evidence of Jesus' Messiahship, a vast body of alleged Messianic predictions had been discovered in the Old Testament, and Jesus Himself was even alleged to have sanctioned this exegesis (Lk 24^{27}). The third was to present Christian morality in glaring contrast with that of the pagan world; every evangelistic appeal is followed by its moral application, by 'didache'; and a pamphlet of pure 'didache' by a recognized 'didascalos' (Ja 3^{1}, 'we') was published in epistolary form. Fourthly the loyalty of Christianity to the Imperial Government receives considerable notice, as the Jews had convinced the Roman authorities that Christians were followers of a rival pretender and were antinomian. Injunctions to loyalty appear in every Christian writing save John's Apocalypse, and that book was long rejected at Rome: the Epistle to the Romans, 1 Peter and Acts may specially be noticed; it is not indeed impossible that much of the material in the later part of Acts was originally collected to serve as St. Paul's defence before Nero's court. It is in a way curious that the biographical and epistolary forms were as much recognized outside Rome as in it, even in the Apocalypse. The Gospel according to Matthew, though containing a Judaistic source and being throughout apocalyptic, is in form as biographical as Mark or Luke. So is the Fourth Gospel, though in substance it is nearer to a Platonic dialogue in which the author puts his beliefs into the mouth of Jesus, as Plato put his into the mouth of Socrates. So natural was it to follow Rome on the purely literary side.

Let us sum up our conclusion. When the second generation of Christians adopted the policy of appealing to the Gentile world through the newest genres of writing, they had no thought of creating a canon to be recognized as Scripture. But, had they not adopted this policy, there would have been no writings which could afterwards have been so canonized. The existence of a New Testament is thus due to their action. So well was the Roman choice made that by the time the pseudonymous '2 Peter' was written, the Pauline Epistles and presumably 1 Peter were recognized as inspired Scripture. Nearly half our New Testament consists of 'Epistles.' So in the providence of God an eccentricity of Seneca and the Roman admiration for Cicero's style gave us nearly half of our New Testament.[1]

[1] To save space I have not mentioned the books which received some support for admission to the Canon but were finally rejected. They do not affect the argument.

Literature

COMMENTARY ON ROMANS

Anders Nygren is well known to English readers as the author of 'Agape and Eros' through the excellent translation of Mr. Philip Watson. Nygren has now published a stimulating theological *Commentary on Romans* (S.C.M.; 30s. net), which is sure to receive a warm welcome in Great Britain. The cover informs us that it has already appeared in several impressions in America and prophesies that 'it is likely to become a standard commentary in this country.' This hope is well founded, but we shall still need the great commentaries of Sanday, Denney, Dodd, and Boylan, for the new work is not built on the same plan. Nygren's main endeavour is to bring out the religious and theological teaching of the Epistle. We may say at once that his exposition is marked by deep insight into St. Paul's thought, rich spiritual power, and a style which is striking and original. It is a tribute to the translator, Carl C. Rasmussen, that the reader hardly realizes that he is reading a translation from Swedish. The book is vital and no one who is concerned to know the essence of Christianity can afford to miss it.

The writer at once challenges us by his rendering of Hab 2^4 in Ro 1^{17}, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.' The first part of this sentence, he maintains, is the theme of Ro 1–4, and the second part, 'He shall live,' is the key-note of 5–8, chapters which treat successively the believer's freedom from Wrath, Sin, the Law, and Death. This summary is very apt, although it may be doubted, with Sanday, whether 'through faith' can be taken with 'he who is righteous' rather than with 'shall live.' A most effective use is made of the distinction of two æons, described by St. Paul in Ro 4^{12-21}. 'In the old æon, which began with Adam, death rules with unlimited power over all the children of Adam. In the new æon, which burst upon man with the resurrection of Christ, life has come to dominion still more mightily' (p. 23). Among other themes, upon which Nygren has moving things to say, may be mentioned his treatment of the 'wrath of God' (1^{18}), of 'natural theology' (1^{19-21}), of *Sola Fide* (3^{28}), the omission of the negative in 4^{19}, his preference for 'we have peace' in 5^1, his submission that the genitive in 'God's love' (5^5) is subjective, and his exposition of the important phrases, 'free from sin' (6^{18}), 'the likeness of sinful flesh' (8^3), and 'the redemption of our body' (8^{23}). His discussion of 7^{14-25} is also of the greatest interest, although here most readers will probably prefer to agree, with Sanday, Denney, and Dodd, that it is the pre-conversion experience of the Apostle, as seen with Christian eyes, which is described in the section. His rendering also of *hilasterion* (3^{25}) as 'mercy seat' provokes discussion, and even more the strong emphasis on predestination in his interesting exposition of 9–11. Perhaps most of all, readers will wish for a closer definition of Justification and the Righteousness of God. Granting that Luther taught that Justification is the gospel, the forgiveness of sins, and the appropriation by faith of Christ's righteousness, they will be disposed to ask, What, after all, is real nature? And, recognizing that the Righteousness of God is the dominating theme of the Epistle, they will ask how it is 'given' and 'received' by faith.

These comments will show how provocative and yet how stimulating Nygren's commentary is. The book is certainly likely to enrich preaching in a day when it is futile for the preacher to be content with peripheral themes. Here is a book which will lead him to the centre of things and enable him to preach the gospel with power.

Vincent Taylor

PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY

Professor Nels F. S. Ferré, of the Chair of Philosophical Theology at Vanderbilt University School of Religion, has already published the first three volumes of a projected series of which his most recent publication, now under review, is the fourth. The general subject of the series is 'Reason and the Christian Faith.' This fourth volume, the author's first book to be published in Great Britain, should make his name more widely known. For he is an able and thoughtful writer. The title is *The Christian Understanding of God* (S.C.M.; 18s. net).

The thesis here illustrated is that the Christian faith must express itself within some system of thought, whether an alien system or a development of the principles inherent in its own nature. The substance of the book has been given as Lectures under the Rall, Fondren, and Gates Foundations. Reference to the Notes would be made easier were the chapter titles added there after the chapter numbers.

The modern philosopher who appears to have been of most help to Professor Ferré is A. N. Whitehead. Among other recent philosophical and theological writers not infrequently cited are Whittaker, Hocking, Tillich, Barth, and Brunner. One misses some reference to F. R. Tennant, whose

writings are well known in America. ('Brunner and Moses' is a striking collocation at first sight; it would have been well to give 'Moses' his Christian name or initials! One cannot but notice, too, a number of names apparently mis-spelled: for example, Dod, Cairn, Hermann, Montefiori.)

The work is planned on a large scale. In the first section the Nature of God is treated, with subsections on God and the World, Time and Eternity, The Sovereignty of God. There is some insistence here, in this section, on the concept of the Body of God. Here also is found the distinctive contention that, as Boodin phrased it, 'in the symphony of Divine love, time and eternity are complementary.' In other words, two orders of time are to be postulated, eternal or God's time and conditional or created time.

The second section treats of the Work of God, with subsections on Creation and Providence, Revelation, Incarnation, Last Things. Here, obviously, the author draws near to the great doctrines of traditional Christian Theology. The subsection on Incarnation is very illuminating on the author's standpoint as a philosophical theologian. He conceives of his task as 'creative criticism' and 'creative formulation' from the heart of the Christian faith. The exercise of it results in a certain liberalism, especially on the Person of Christ.

Reviewing the book as a whole, we are left with a firm impression of its logical clarity and confidence of style (even where the discussion is highly speculative), and of the Christian zeal and sincerity of its author. It is scarcely a book for the beginner in theological studies, but it should be appreciated by readers who are acquainted with modern trends of Biblical Criticism and Systematic Theology, and who accept the author's view that Philosophical Theology as operating with 'the larger logic of the faith' is not basically doctrinal.

W. FULTON

THE CURE OF SOULS

In the Preface to *A History of the Cure of Souls*, by Mr. John T. McNeill (S.C.M.; 25s. net), the 'Cure of Souls' is defined as 'the sustaining and curative treatment of persons in those matters that reach beyond the requirements of the animal life,' and these very broad limits enable the author to take a comprehensive view of his subject. His interest is mainly historical, and perhaps too minutely so; the list of authorities might with advantage have been shortened for the sake of fuller treatment of the more outstanding. While by far the greater part of the material comes from Christian sources, contributions are also levied from Jewish, Greek, and Indian sources. Much attention is directed towards the mediæval period, and the attitude of the Celtic Church is illuminatingly described. The chapters on the Anglican and Scottish Churches are appreciative and fair, and interesting variations of Presbyterianism from English Puritanism are noted.

The changing, but fundamentally continuous, tension between opposing points of view is the prevailing theme of the book, and this might be historically symbolized in the opposition to Indulgences associated with the name of Luther. From this Reformation point we are assisted in this book to look backwards and forwards. We may trace the development in early Christian centuries from the practice of public confession to the more private procedure resulting in the setting up of the confessional, and note how the sacrament of Penance led to excessive sacerdotalism, how the questions were repeatedly discussed as to whether confession should be compulsory or voluntary, regular or occasional, whether it was not often too retrospective and detailed, too mechanically treated, obscuring the evangelical emphasis upon the grace of Christ; whether danger did not lie in the priest's claim to grant absolution instead of simply to declare the forgiveness of God. So we see the emergence of the wider conception of the director of souls, and are immediately faced with the danger that 'direction' may become too dominating. In regard to this and other dangers associated with the cure of souls we are urged to remember that they occur in every form of ecclesiastical organization, and that it is never a question of presence or absence, but only of *more* and *less*. The concluding chapter discusses usefully the relation between religion and medical science, especially psychiatry. This is shown to be by no means new, and illustrations of its use are given dating back to 1660. The author's plea is for co-operation rather than controversy. 'The empiricist,' he says, 'has no meagre service to render, but the religious guide has no reason to go into retirement.' Psychology without religion is even more dangerous than religion without psychology—'the non-religious psychiatrist is as incompetent to deal with religious experiences as a blind man to interpret a work of art.' The cure of souls, our author thinks, is part of the vocation of all religious men, but all are not equally suited for it. Those who are both fitted and faithful may be regarded as belonging to a 'spiritual *élite*, a fraternity that spans the churches and even the religions.'

W. S. URQUHART

SECOND ISAIAH

Professor C. R. North, whose masterly study of 'The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah' is well

known, has now published a short commentary on *Isaiah 40–55* in 'The Torch Bible Commentaries' (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). In accordance with the plan of the series the Biblical text is not printed, but each section of the book has a short paragraph of interpretation followed by a few notes on selected points. The real value of the work lies in the general interpretation and in the introduction to the whole. Needless to say Professor North adopts the sixth century date of the prophet from whom we get these chapters, and he also follows the common view that locates the prophet in Babylonia. He offers as the explanation of the combination of Deutero-Isaiah with Proto-Isaiah the suggestion that associations of disciples of Proto-Isaiah continued to exist for two centuries and that a 'revival' broke out in their circle, giving rise to Deutero-Isaiah. Dr. North has a good section on the fulfilment of the prophecy and its interpretation, and another in which he summarizes in a few pages his work on the Suffering Servant. He is not content to consider the work of a commentator done when he has penetrated as nearly as he can the mind of the writer, but recognizes that the significance of a book is only fully perceived in the light of what emerged from it. He therefore offers a Christian interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah, not in the sense of reading the New Testament back into it, but in the sense of seeing the promise in the light of its fulfilment. This is a book simply written and able to be understood by unlearned readers, and it should be widely useful to preachers and teachers.

H. H. Rowley

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

In 1949 two large volumes were published in America, dealing with the History, Culture, and Religion of the Jews, under the editorship of Dr. Louis Finkelstein. In this work the chapter dealing with the History of Israel in the Old Testament period was contributed by Professor W. F. Albright of Baltimore. This chapter was subsequently published separately for the use of students, and an English edition has now been issued under the title *The Biblical Period* (Blackwell; 5s. net). It offers a brilliant summary of the period and is fully up to date in its information. It is marked by accurate archæological knowledge and it reflects the present recognition of a substantial historical basis for the early traditions of Israel. 'Aside from a few die-hards among older scholars, there is scarcely a single Biblical historian who has not been impressed by the rapid accumulation of data supporting the substantial historicity of patriarchal tradition' (p. 3). It is not for the early period only that the author speaks with knowledge and authority, but throughout the work he draws on his wide familiarity with sources, both Biblical and extra-Biblical, and on his unrivalled knowledge of modern literature dealing with them. Professor Albright's views are always decided, though the pages of valuable notes at the end indicate that on some points he has changed his view from time to time, and the reader will throughout realize that the confidence is that of a master. Serious students of Old Testament History at any level will find this an invaluable summary, and its sales on this side of the Atlantic may be expected to match those on the other.

H. H. Rowley

PREPARING FOR LUND

Many of the most important issues which divide Christians to-day have their roots in differing conceptions of the nature of the Church. That became plain at the second World Conference on Faith and Order held at Edinburgh in 1937. It is not surprising, therefore, that in preparation for the third World Conference to be held at Lund this year a valiant attempt has been made to survey this important field, and to present the delegates of the Churches with authoritative material for their consideration of it.

The volume before us, *The Nature of the Church*, edited by Dr. R. Newton Flew (S.C.M.; 21s. net), consists of two sections. In the first, representing the European situation, there are papers on the doctrine of the Church from the point of view of many different communions, from the Greek Orthodox to the Society of Friends. The editor, having failed to secure a contribution from any Roman Catholic theologian, has himself sketched the Roman doctrine. With that exception the statements come from representatives of the tradition in question, and in most cases have behind them some formal ecclesiastical endorsement or at least the authority of several theologians of the tradition besides the actual writer. The contributions of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland are from the capable hands of Professor Leonard Hodgson and Professor G. D. Henderson respectively.

The second part of the book consists of a report of the American Theological Committee drawn up by Dean Clarence T. Craig, together with eleven authoritative denominational statements based on a questionnaire. It need hardly be said that this volume, like the companion volumes on 'Ways of Worship' and 'Inter-Communion,' is indispensable to all engaged in ecumenical discussion, as well as valuable to all who would like to be instructed churchmen. There is an obvious misprint in a date on p. 103.

Stewart Mechie

A CLARIFIED THEOLOGY?

Because theology deals with realities that ought to have a decisive bearing on every man's life, any theology that passes the common man's comprehension lies open to the charge of being an academic gymnastic, harmful to real religion if seriously pressed. Well aware of this, theologians are often ruefully self-critical. A wistful welcome therefore from scholars as well as the general public is always waiting for any worthy attempt to be at once simple and adequate, to sound the depths and explore the ranges and make report in plain speech. In the case of a science it may be possible to give a popular account that, while lightly skating over and around difficulties, is interesting and true as far as it goes. In theology, however, even in trying to be popular, the theologian must come to actual grips with fundamentals. Those most competent to make the effort are often daunted by its difficulty and leave the field to jauntier minds.

Dr. James Parkes, however, who is a theologian of no mean reputation, does offer in *God at Work* (Putnam; 10s. 6d. net) what aims at being a popular systematic theology; and, while often surprising, it repays reading. He analyses the human situation into three elements—communal organization, personal relations, and scientific method. And he views the Divine influence on men, not as the indivisible personal impact of God summed up in the Christian term 'grace,' but as the impartation of creative power—'naked power' is one of his phrases—which enables man to function successfully in regard to these three elements in life. This power has been released especially at three moments—at Sinai, for communal organization; at Calvary, for personal relations; and at and after the Renaissance, for scientific method. Each of these releases of power has had its own independently valid result; hence Judaism, Christianity, and Scientific Humanism. The doctrine of the Trinity may be taken as a symbol of the three modes of Divine action.

On the operation of Divine power in each of these three ways Dr. Parkes has much that is excellent to say. Most noteworthy perhaps is his description of the characteristics of Judaism—no authoritative clergy, just leaders accepted for personal character and learning—the continual revision and re-interpretation of law—personal and corporate responsibility—belief in the ability of reason to understand and carry out God's plan.

But to make Sinai the first great 'moment' is to ignore the tradition that begins with Abraham and the Promise rather than with Moses and the Law, and also the fact that the prophets, who are the point at which a special revelation can be historically established, do not dwell on the Exodus or the Ten Commandments. And to make scientific humanism an independent 'moment' sets aside the point recently stressed by Dr. John Baillie, that the whole scientific development was made possible by the Christian view of God's transcendence.

One main criticism of the book is its treatment of personality. And the neat scheme does not amount to a truly Christian theology. For while it finally urges the need to combine all the powers and insights of Judaism, Christianity, and science, this does not make Christ central and dominant as the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

R. W. Stewart

THE PASCHAL MYSTERY

In recent times an astonishing movement of revival has been manifest in the Roman Catholic Church. Missionary activity has been quickened, and in two ways almost a new care has been manifested towards ordinary believers. For one thing the congregations have got a much larger part in public worship; and for another it has been realized that the part they play must be an intelligent one. If the language of the Mass is still Latin, translations and explanations are provided in the vernacular. A real attempt is now made to render the solemn services of the Church really a source of spiritual quickening and nourishment. Especially in France is the wonderful extent and fruitfulness of this, which to Protestants may seem a new development, most evident.

From Catholic France comes an admirable book by Louis Bouyer, Professor of Spiritual Theology at the Institut Catholique de Paris, admirably put into English by Sister Mary Benoit, R.S.M. of St. Xavier College, Chicago—*The Paschal Mystery* (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net). It is a meditation for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Holy Week. Naturally Roman Catholics will profit most from it, but there is much a study of which will benefit all Christians. The author is a learned teacher whose range of reading has been encyclopaedic, and who does not hesitate to quote 'The Christian Year,' or refer to Protestant scholars. His historical discussion of the possible debt of early Christianity to the Mystery Religions is excellent, and his estimate of how Psalmists and Prophets must be read in the light of the fulfilment in Christ will repay the close attention of those who do not go quite all the way with him in his general view of the Old Testament. One feels that despite all the barriers between us, here one is listening to a man of very deep insight into the mystery of the Cross, and of profound spiritual experience.

W. D. Niven

To discover the meaning of justice for the individual Plato analysed the perfect State where he held it could be found 'writ large.' In a very interesting book, *Man Creator or Destroyer* (Allen and Unwin; 16s. net), Dr. George Malcolm Stratton, Professor of Psychology in the University of California, reverses this method. The problem is how can the fierce tensions and hostilities among great nations or within the same nations be overcome. The Professor asks us to consider how the normal child becomes a decent member of Society. Every child is by nature part angel, part demon. He loves to construct and yet he loves to destroy. He comes to decent social living as more and more he realizes his need of others and his duty towards them. Many factors work in this task—first his home, then school, then various associations with his fellows. Then the dawn of ideals, especially the good, where religion plays a great part.

The author exhibits man's greatness as a creator and the terrible depths to which he can sink if his natural tendency to destroy is not mastered.

Hope that war will become unthinkable depends on an extension among the nations of goodwill, sympathy, understanding, and co-operation—a realization that each needs the other and has duties towards it. Much of this has been often said before now but this book says it extremely well and convincingly.

In the reader's mind, of course, one problem will remain—how to get through the Iron Curtain.

What We Believe, by Miss Elsie Gibbs, B.A., and Mr. R. Gladstone Griffith, M.A. (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net), is subtitled, 'A Course of Teaching in the Christian Religion for School or Church.' There are altogether twenty-two chapters beginning with Creation and ending with Life Everlasting. There is a second section of the book in which the material is presented in Lesson Summaries and in Notes on Teaching Methods. The point of view of the book is thoroughly up-to-date and abreast of the latest knowledge. The presentation is all through clear, lucid, and simple. There is a Foreword by Sir Cyril Norwood. There is no doubt that this would make an excellent book on which to base a series of Bible Class or Day School talks on the Christian Faith. The motto of the book is *non nova, sed nove.* The book lives up to its motto and does present the eternal truths in a modern and attractive way. There is one curious omission—the book has no index or table of contents, a fact which is awkward when one is looking for any given chapter within it.

Professor W. Norman Pittenger, S.T.D., of New York, has written a book on *The Christian Sacrifice* (Cumberlege; 21s. net). Its aim, as the sub-title indicates, is to exhibit the place of 'Holy Communion in the Life of the Church.' The author here, as in his previous works, manifests great erudition and clarity of presentation. He begins with a consideration of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ and then with the Eucharist in the New Testament and in the Early Church. This historical survey is very well done. Professor Pittenger owes much to Gregory Dix, Brilioth, and Darwell Stone, but is no mere echo of these teachers. He then proceeds to deal with the Eucharist as Action, as Sacrifice, as Communion, and as Presence. Then we have a chapter on the celebration of the Eucharist, the Eucharist in the World and in the Life of the Body of Christ.

Most interesting is his view of the Eucharist as Sacrifice. It has nothing to do with the view of the Mass as a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead. He reminds us that we are justified in speaking of 'our sacrifice of praise' and are enjoined to 'present ourselves a living sacrifice.' So in the Eucharist we lay it before God to plead before Him the sole availing Sacrifice once for all offered on Calvary, just as we make that plea in our prayers. This is certainly a harmless enough conception of sacrifice.

We admire much in the book, for example its insistence that the Sacrament should never be divorced from the Word—the Sermon is of great importance.

What we regret is Professor Pittenger's dogmatic pronouncement as to the necessity of Episcopacy, if any religious group, however excellent, is to merit the name of 'Church.'

Four out of six volumes by the Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter, to be published under the title *Explore the Book* (Marshall, Morgan, and Scott; 15s. net each), have been issued. These deal with the books of the Old Testament, and offer short Bible studies in which the separate books are successively treated in a homiletical and typological summary. They are intended to accompany the reading of the text of the Bible, and are to be commended for their purpose to further a knowledge of the actual contents and significance of the Bible. While they do not profess to offer a critical study, the author dismisses the critical view of the Pentateuch with a citation from Sir Charles Marston, and devotes many pages to a defence of the unity of Isaiah and of the sixth century dating of Daniel. There is no evidence that he has seriously understood the critical views on these and similar questions, and his labelling of John Skinner as an exponent of 'the more rabid higher criticism' is an inaccurate description of a great scholar. Nor is it wise for an author who has no pretensions to scholarship to discount the learning of S. R. Driver.

School of Religion, Parochial Courses (Mowbray; 5s. net) is the handbook which was used in the Schools of Religion of the London Diocese which were held in Lent, 1952, as the completion of the follow-up of the Mission to London. Three hundred and thirty parishes joined in these Schools of Religion. There are notes and material for four courses of lectures. There is a course on Great Words of the Bible, which includes sections on Faith, Grace, Atonement, Forgiveness, and Sanctification. There is a course on the Sacraments. There is a course on Life in the Church, which includes sections on Prayer, Bible Reading, Public Worship, and the Meaning of Membership. And there is a course on the Christian in Action. A finer set of courses could not be imagined. Right at the beginning it is said: 'It is worth noting that faith need not in the nature of the case be unreasonable; there are many occasions when faith sets reason working.' And here is a magnificent attempt to work out the substance and the implications of the Christian Faith within the Church and within the world. The standard set is amazingly high; here is Biblical theology at its best. There is no attempt to popularize in the bad sense of the term or to water down the great things of the faith. It is impossible that those who came through this course should emerge without a knowledge that was broadened and a faith that was deepened. There is a justly appreciative Foreword by the Lord Bishop of London. The names of the authors of the courses are not given; but these anonymous writers have done a magnificent job.

The *Indian Journal of Theology* (Serampore; Rs. 3 per annum) has begun excellently. It is to be published twice a year, and arrangements have been made for serviceable circulation throughout the Indian Church. The three articles by Indian writers could hardly be bettered for relevance and adequacy. We have rarely seen a more useful treatment of the Christian basis of democracy, and the writer of the article (the editor) invites, very sympathetically, his Hindu fellow-countrymen to face the question whether they can find in the Vedānta a sufficient foundation for the democracy of their new constitution of which they are understandably proud. Another writer performs a similar service for Ceylon and Buddhism, while a third discusses the very live question of missionary service through institutional work. The *Journal* is deserving of the fullest support.

An Introduction to the Life of Jesus, by Miss Agnes Humphreys (S.C.M.; 5s. net), has the avowed aim of helping children to build up a picture of our Lord's life and work. It is supposed to be aimed at Secondary Schools; but if the book has value it would be for young children and not for Senior Secondary Scholars. The book is not altogether satisfactory. It takes Biblical passages and weaves them into a dramatic form of story. In the re-writing of the Prodigal Son Parable, the son is made to say when he returns home, 'I'm sorry, father, I've been so bad a son. Let me be your servant for I'm not worthy to be your son.' One of the supreme points of the Parable as Jesus told it is that, though the son planned to say this, he never got a chance to say, 'Let me be your servant.' The father stopped him before he could say the words. The lesson of the Parables of the Friend at Midnight and of the Unjust Judge is given as persistence in prayer. In neither case is that so. The lesson is, If a churlish householder and if an unjust judge can be coerced into giving some one what he or she wants, *how much more* will God give His children what is to their good? Lk 11^{9-13} makes that absolutely clear; and there can be nothing more dangerous than to teach children that God can, in effect, be badgered into answering prayers. It is stated that Levi, the tax-gatherer, may have heard Jesus teaching in the Synagogue at Capernaum. That is not possible because tax-gatherers were barred from the Synagogue services. But the book has value. By the very arrangement of it it does set out the life of Jesus as a whole and as a story. The questions which follow the lessons are well chosen and will really help children to think out the significance of the life and teaching of Jesus. Teachers of junior children will find in this book much to use.

Canon W. J. Phythian-Adams, D.D., has written a small book, *With Unveiled Face* (The Tufton Press; 3s. 6d. net), offering a short course of Bible study with a typological approach. He rightly insists on the large place the traditions of the Exodus had in the thought of Israel and the constant reminiscences of those traditions throughout the Bible, but more doubtfully maintains that the Second Person of the Trinity is the Angel of the Presence in the Old Testament. He is held to have appeared to Hagar, Abraham, and Jacob, to Moses at Horeb, to Balaam, to Joshua, to Gideon, and to Manoah, and to have been the Jehovah of Hosts of Isaiah's vision. With this Jehovah of Hosts the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah is identified. Throughout the book there is a constant passage from the Old Testament to the New, and the reader will hardly fail to have his knowledge of Scripture enriched, though he may be doubtful of this approach. The name of Cyrus is held to have been interpolated in Deutero-Isaiah, and with its removal the Servant is found in the 'Cyrus passages.'

Preaching and the Techniques of Contemporary Culture

By Professor W. Fraser Mitchell, Birmingham

The peculiarity of preaching consists in its continuity as a vehicle of expression, extending from the fifth century B.C. to the present day. No other invention of man has persisted with so little change. Drama has a long and connected history, but classical, mediæval and contemporary drama presents us with significant differences. Epic, written to a precise formula, is probably now impossible, because certain ingredients (such as the intervention of divine beings or expeditions to the world of the dead) have become unusable. The novel is a comparatively recent invention. But preaching persists, and, until quite recent days, maintained its traditional close connexion with the prevailing literary forms and the techniques of public appeal. To-day, however, this very connexion may in itself be a weakness. It may mean that the preacher is talking the language of his grandfather and inviting us to share the emotions of a bygone age.

The purpose of preaching has not always been rightly understood. Preaching as we know it dates from the occasion of our Lord's Ascension. This in itself is significant, because it means that its *raison d'être*, its main purpose, is to set out the *complete* gospel and not merely to emphasize moral teaching or even the high significance of the Crucifixion. This *complete* gospel was the *kerygma*—the herald's message—which the early preachers were concerned to give. No pagan religion has room for preaching, because pagan religions have no strict and uniform systems of theology ; they appeal to the emotional side of man, not to the rational. Judaism had a theology. The beliefs of the Jews could be formulated and argued about, and after the reading of the Law in the synagogue there were discussions of particular points.

These discussions were simple and straightforward, for the Jews detested rhetorical devices such as by the time of Christ and St. Paul they were familiar with among the Greeks and other inhabitants of the Roman Empire. And Christ Himself reinforced the Jewish standpoint when He counselled His followers not to worry about what they would say on particular occasions. But the earliest Christian preachers soon found they must speak in a manner to be easily understood by people accustomed to the orderly speeches of classical orators as heard in the Law Courts and Deliberative Assemblies. Law and politics already used rhetoric ; religion had to follow suit.

The two main characteristics of classical rhetoric were, first, its *effectiveness*, which it derived from a post-war situation in fifth-century Sicily, and, secondly, its *attractiveness*, which was the legacy of the Ionian Sophists. When liberty of Parliamentary debate was suppressed among the Greek cities after the battle of Chaeroneia, when the father of Alexander the Great made Macedon the supreme power in his part of the world, oratory became literature. Something similar happened when the Roman State became an Empire. Isocrates in Greece and Cicero at Rome are both masters of oratory, but they are also masters of literary style. Effective in their own day, they remain readable in ours. Not unnaturally, then, when teachers of this oratory were converted to Christianity, and St. Augustine's case was by no means unique, they applied its techniques to preaching. Their sermons, momentarily effective, form part of general European literature.

Preaching, in consequence, remained closely connected with literature until the Reformation, when (with Calvin) expository preaching attempted to revert to the Jewish custom of commenting on and discussing the meaning of Biblical passages read at the time of public worship. Mr. Parker in his book, *The Oracles of God*, exalts this as a main purpose of preaching ; but, as we have noted, it was not so originally. Preaching was older than the fixing of the canon of the New Testament and was essentially a free proclamation—with suddenness and directness, as of a herald sent to offer terms to a beleaguered city—the *kerygma*. And preaching must remain this. It should do what the Bible itself does—proclaim the gospel. And to do this, during the first few centuries of the Christian era, it helped itself by employing the means by which men proclaimed other facts, namely, by using the rhetorical devices of these times.

To do so involved for the intending preachers a lengthy, strenuous, and liberal education. A man's language (as Cicero had enunciated in the *De Oratore*), ' must be ornate and copious from knowledge, since unless there be beneath the surface matter understood and felt by the speaker, oratory becomes an empty and most puerile flow of words.' Preaching, in consequence, can never be merely the proclamation of the gospel : to be both effective and attractive it must be this proclamation made in terms of the cultural experience of a given

period. All preaching that has been of value has been saturated with the interests of the time in which it was produced. Men do not live in a vacuum, and they cannot be preached to in a vacuum.

Each civilization has its own cultural forms. Preaching has always been closely related to these. When the Middle Ages became obsessed with logic, preaching became an interminable series of propositions. When the Reformed Church in England had broken with Rome, and sought to replace Papal Authority by appeals to the consensus of opinion among the Fathers, Anglican sermons (such as those of Andrewes and Donne) became mosaics of patristic quotations, and Puritan sermons mosaics of Biblical ones. When, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the flowing paragraph and the generalized portrait was the ideal of the historian, the sermon followed suit. Both in form and content the sermon remained true to its ancestry and mindful of its contemporary setting.

This brings us to the very heart of the problem confronting preachers in our own day. Our cultural patterns, in spite of their continuity with the past, have changed rapidly in the last fifty years. Our literary forms are varied and uncertain. There is no longer a common mode in which men address their fellows on all the most important subjects in life. And the sermon, which, as we have seen, has in the past been closely related to the thought-forms and modes of expression of a given period, can no longer be certain of making a proclamation in a mode which is either effective or attractive to contemporary man.

In literature in general the change in the first forty years of this century has been from the rhetorical to the psychological, from the smooth and adequate description of outward happenings in the lives of men and women to the analysis and recording of inner states of mind or of the emotions. Novelists no longer prescribe their duties to their characters, and so to their readers, because they present their characters less as characters in the moral sense than as bundles of reflexes, or beings acted upon rather than active, whose life-stories have no meaning, but only significance, for themselves from moment to moment. In all her novels George Eliot shows how some one dominant thought or sentiment provided a life-line for her characters —especially her heroines—by which they were able to come to terms with their environment and become of use to others. In Virginia Woolf's novels the characters might well be autumn leaves of motley colours blown about aimlessly by the wind, meeting and parting, forming patterns and breaking patterns, to their own intense discomfort and bewilderment, and finding no coherence in their experiences.

The general trend of modern literature is to present the world as one writer sees it, not to attempt an interpretation. 'The present-day novelist,' according to A. C. Ward (in *The Nineteen-Twenties*, commenting on Aldous Huxley), 'is inclined to leave moral judgment to his readers. It is *revelation* and not *condemnation* that he accepts as his task.' Dickens wrote passionately of evil things which he hated and wished to expose. And the preachers of his day preached in like manner, although some of them felt less passionately about some social evils than he did. What are preachers to do to-day, when literary men, and the world at large, are prepared to view almost any question with complete detachment ?

Modern poetry does not affirm, it only records. By singing the Wesleys' hymns, Dimond notes (in *The Psychology of the Methodist Revival*), men and women confirmed themselves in what they believed, and at the same time transferred their convictions to others who heard them. But modern poetry is not concerned with certitudes ; it whispers its own misgivings, and the poet's neighbours hardly overhear, so busy are they with their own. What, then, is the preacher to do ? If he affirms, who will heed him ? Especially, when, for many in our time, particularly the young, affirmation appears crude, in bad taste, and a proof that the preacher is out of touch with his contemporaries.

'How shall they hear without a preacher ?' asked St. Paul. But, 'How shall men preach if their contemporaries expect merely a succession of their personal impressions which may strike their hearers quite otherwise ?' is the problem for many a preacher to-day. For, preaching, it is to be remembered, like the presentation of drama, requires an audience or at least an auditory. It depends on a high degree of reciprocity between the preacher (or actor) and those who listen (or watch). What is astonishing about the great plays of Western civilization is astonishing likewise when we read the sermons of the great preachers of past centuries : they still 'find us,' or, as the Quakers would say, 'speak to our condition.' But they do not do this to us merely as individuals, but rather because they deal with individuals in particular social settings which bear a strong resemblance to our own, or because we in our particular social setting are yet so placed that we are able to share reciprocally with the preacher or dramatist—or it may be the actor—in his treatment of his theme. Plays, ancient or contemporary which do not appeal to large numbers of potential playgoers, are quickly withdrawn. Preachers who do not attract a large part of their potential auditory are left to face empty pews. There is a 'total' life situation in which men are involved which has to be remembered by dramatist, actor, and preacher. A play which might have delighted our grandparents may

have no appeal for our generation. A preacher whose subject-matter or style might have given him popularity and influence fifty (or even twenty-five) years ago may be out of touch with men and women to-day.

This problem is too often treated as if it arose solely from a preacher's individual preferences in style or presentation of material. A preacher's style and his selection of material depend ultimately on the reciprocity which exists between him and the emotional, thinking, active world of his day. From the time when Matthew Arnold first described each man as being 'en-isled' in a peculiar loneliness and uniqueness, the unlikeness and particularity of each man's experience has been pretty widely recognized. It is only more recently that we have come to realize that the 'sea of life' which separates and joins man and his fellows provides the climatic conditions of his island state. And the preacher who would reach the various islands or personality must have a sound acquaintance with the tides and currents of the surrounding sea. He must be a sociologist as well as a psychologist, and that not primarily in the sense that he should be able to expose the inadequacy of particular sociological theories (for example, the Marxist), and demonstrate the importance of the additional *data* which Christianity contributes to sociological study. That, if we may be permitted to continue our seafaring metaphor, would mean that the preacher exerted himself either to prevent men landing on a continental land mass where conditions will not turn out to be all that tired voyagers imagine, or to induce them to land on another where conditions are propitious. It is to ignore the fact that most men are not heading for any clearly recognized coast but are quite literally 'at sea,' without chart or compass. Yet, our contemporaries without chart or compass as they are, for whom literature merely records successive and, it may be, disconnected impressions, are subject to influences and directives which the preacher dare not ignore.

The Press, the Cinema, and wireless broadcasting proclaim nothing, affirm nothing, neither argue nor persuade. They none of them offend against the psychological prejudices of the partially educated nor against the class-consciousness of those who recognize no elders and betters and refuse to be told what to feel or think or do. Yet, all the time, these three paramount influences in contemporary life (or some one of them) are arousing the emotions, moulding the opinions and inspiring the conduct of those with whom the preacher has to deal, or are making of them the kind of people whom the preacher cannot readily reach.

If we combine broadcasting with television, with which, it would appear likely, it is in future to have a close connexion, it is plain that all three methods of influencing men depend on a combination of suggestion and imitation—on what is heard with the ear and what is shown to the eye. If we take up a newspaper or magazine in a foreign language unknown to us, we all recognize amid the welter of strange words, or it may be (to us) unintelligible characters, the pictorial representation of common commodities familiar to us (for example, a Singer sewing machine or an Underwood typewriter in a Chinese or Israeli periodical). What many people do not recognize so immediately is that the format and techniques employed by the Press and the Cinema, and to a large extent in broadcasting, are gradually familiarizing our generation with certain ideas, expectations, hopes, and fears, which recur as regularly as such familiar pictorial representations.

The Cinema, in particular, achieves its ends through the saturation of the jaded and the immature. It presents them with alternative and substitute experience which they would rather have—though that is not all the Cinema at its best gives, and not all that it might give. For the moment, however, it is probably the aspect of it which most concerns the preacher. But the Press and the wireless broadcasts work much more in the same manner than is generally realized. It is true that it is not the intention of the best editors or of the producers of wireless programmes that this should be so. But the insufficient evidence, the tabloid form, and the irrelevant details of the news presented, and the moments at which and the conditions under which Press and Broadcast reach hundreds of readers and listeners circumvent the best intentions of journalists and broadcasters.

The precise degree to which many of our contemporaries are conditioned by broadcasting is still too little recognized. For most of us, broadcasting is something we can listen to or reject at will. But thousands of our contemporaries must listen willy nilly, no matter how tired, how perplexed, or how emotionally unsettled they may be. If we recall the unpleasantness of orders given us by loud-speakers from street-vans in war-time we shall be able to place ourselves nearer the position of many, for whom the voice over the ether comes as an inescapable imperative, as if the universe had suddenly found tongue, and, in popular parlance, 'was telling' them. Broadcasting, which has brought comfort to thousands, who have found in it a medium of strength and encouragement, has also supplied a master to thousands in the insistent voice which speaks from early morning till late at night, and leaves no silence in which the voice of conscience can any more be heard.

It is with people living under some or all of the conditions we have enumerated that the preacher

of to-day has to deal. What, then, is he to do? Is he to follow the example set by some in the giving of religious addresses to children, and carefully abstain from pointing the moral? Is he merely to present certain episodes from the life of Christ or certain characters illustrative of Christian living in the centuries that separate that life from our own time? Is he to compete with the Cinema, and try to saturate those who are unwilling to heed preaching with selected emotions acceptable to Christians? Is he to imitate the popular Press, especially in its 'human interest' paragraphs and see that his sermons contain references to Father's gardening, Mother's cooking or knitting fads, and Tom and Alice's latest hobby? Is he to model himself on the broadcaster, and preface a reading of parts of the Sermon on the Mount with the announcement: 'This is an actual recording of what our Lord said to His first disciples almost two thousand years ago, which we are fortunate to be able to pass on to you?'

All these are devices which, it is safe to guess, have been tried or are being tried as means of bringing the message of the gospel to this generation. Some of them may even have a useful part to play in evangelization. But they cannot become substitutes for preaching. Indeed, imitation by the preacher of all or any of these means is bound to fail just because it is imitation, and those who are influenced by those features of modern life which have been mentioned are for that very reason inoculated against such attempts. Those who read modern literature with intelligence and appreciation will detect a purposeful note in the most impressionistic sermon. The mass satisfactions to be found in the Cinema cannot be provided by the sermon, even if they may be by other parts of a church service. The concentration (however brief) required of those who listen to preaching is far greater than that required of the customary reader of newspapers. Why go to church if one can hear a broadcast sermon at home?

Attempts of two sorts seem to have been made to meet the problem set by modern literature. Either the preacher endeavours to point out the inconsistencies or inadequacies of this literature, or seeks to put forward particular portions of Scripture, or particular episodes recorded in Scripture, as even more illuminating treatments of topical themes. Thus, we are told, *Mr. Britling Sees It Through* is the modern Job, and the author of Ecclesiastes knew almost everything that the modern psychologist can tell us. This leads to nothing except to contempt for preacher and pulpit alike; intelligent listeners go away feeling that the preacher has spoken his piece and earned his keep, but more often than not without having heard the gospel over against the criticism offered or the parallel drawn.

The cinema-conditioned auditory cannot thrill to the most vivid word-pictures of the most eloquent of preachers. Indeed, much of the imaginative response which preachers in past periods could count on from their hearers, as they elaborated the details of a parable or described such incidents as St. Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus, is now wanting, because the child and adult who is consistently stimulated by pictorial material, either in the Press or on the screen or film-strip, is fast losing the power of imagining for himself. The film-strip in school, useful as it may be in factual presentation, is definitely out of place where imagination should be evoked, and is yet another obstacle for the Sunday School teacher and the preacher to surmount.

After the exciting fare provided by the newspaper—especially the Sunday newspaper—what sermon but must seem a trifle dull? And attempts to make preaching a church version of *Current Affairs* would be fraught with considerable dangers. Either the preacher must speak with authority as the Pope or run the risk of presenting the gospel in terms of a particular social philosophy.

These considerations bring us back to the original conception of preaching as a *kerygma* or message delivered by a herald sounding a lone, arresting note which calls men from their preoccupations or distractions and compels their attention. The preacher is not here to come to terms with the conditions he finds in the world, but to offer terms from God to men and women who are affected by these conditions. As the herald's message to a beleaguered city would be most likely to be listened to if the besiegers had gauged accurately the existence of famine, faction, war-weariness, and other distresses among the citizens, so the present-day preacher, in so far as he recognizes the factors we have noted and makes allowance for their effects on his contemporaries will be able to sound a message in terms which are at once arresting and persuasive.

All preaching, as we have noted, depends on these two possibilities—being arresting or attractive, and being persuasive or effective. But these two elements in preaching are inseparable. You cannot have attractive preaching which is not also effective, for the attraction of preaching is not something extrinsic, but is bound up with the degree to which men are moved by it. The ultimate test for a sermon, as Bossuet saw, is that it should make the hearer do something. The attractiveness, or arresting quality, in preaching depends on the power of a preacher to analyse clearly the existing situation at a given time and place, and to bring the message of the gospel into effective relation with the lives of his contemporaries.

Recently Published Fragments of the Greek New Testament

By Professor Bruce M. Metzger, Ph.D., D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.

During the last decade (1941–51) nearly thirty fragments of the Greek New Testament, dating from the third to the seventh or eighth century, were made available in various publications. About two-thirds of the number of fragments are parchment, the rest are papyrus. It is doubtless true that none of these documents is as spectacular an addition to our knowledge of the text of the New Testament as were the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri discovered twenty years ago. At the same time it must be acknowledged that several of these recently published fragments are of quite considerable importance, and all of them taken together shed light upon several problems of great interest to the palæographer and textual critic of the New Testament.

For example, among single finds of more than ordinary interest is a parchment leaf preserved from a third century codex which contains the greater part of the Second Epistle of John. This document is a century older than either the Codex Vaticanus or the Codex Sinaiticus, hitherto the two earliest witnesses to the text of this Epistle.

Five or six other parchment or papyrus fragments date from the fourth century and are therefore welcome additions to the limited number of New Testament witnesses from that century. These as well as others from the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries contribute directly to our knowledge of the extent of the diffusion of early types of New Testament text. Two of the documents are of considerable extent, one containing forty consecutive pages of the Gospel according to John, and another containing parts of seven Epistles of Paul, including a few verses of Philemon, not hitherto extant on papyrus. Finally, all the fragments, of whatever extent, supply evidence which bears directly upon the question of the relative popularity of roll and codex among the early Christians.

It is the purpose of the following check-list of manuscripts, which have been arranged in the sequence of the books of the New Testament, to supply information as to (*a*) the extent of the Scriptural passage preserved; (*b*) the *siglum* officially assigned to the manuscript;[1] (*c*) the place whence the manuscript comes; (*d*) the name of the editor of the fragment, with the number which he gave to it; (*e*) its approximate date by century in Roman numerals; (*f*) its material; (*g*) its format, whether roll or codex; (*h*) the text-family or recension to which the editor thought the document belonged;[2] and (*i*) any miscellaneous remark.

[1] Grateful appreciation is due Professor Kurt Aland, of Halle and Berlin, for his kindness in communicating to the present writer the official numbers of nineteen of the documents listed here.

ABBREVIATIONS

PAntin—C. H. Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, Part i. (Egyptian Exploration Society) [London, 1950].

PColt—Lionel Casson and Ernest L. Hettich, *Excavations at Nessana*, Vol. ii. *Literary Papyri* (Colt Archæological Institute) [Princeton, 1950].

POslo—Levi Amundsen, 'Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection,' *Symbolæ osloenses*, xxiv. [1945] 121–147.

POxy—E. Lobel, C. H. Roberts, and E. P. Wegener, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part xviii. (Egyptian Exploration Society) [London, 1941].

PSI—Giovanni Card. Mercati in Medea Norsa, *Papyri greci e latini*, Vol. xiii. Fasc. i. (Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana) [Firenze, 1949].

Sanz—Peter Sanz, *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes*, i. (*Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussamlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, N.S., iv. Folge) [Baden bei Wien, 1946].

(*a*) Mt 11^{25-30}; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{62}$; (*c*) provenience unknown; (*d*) POslo inv. 1661 (Amundsen, #1); (*e*) IV cent. (probably earlier part); (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex of diminutive size (originally about 6.6 × 5.6 cm.); (*h*) possibly Koine: (*i*) extract from a lectionary (?).

(*a*) Mt 26^{75}–$27^{1.\ 3-4}$; (*b*) 0231; (*c*) Antinoë; (*d*) PAntin 11; (*e*) IV cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex (the entire Gospel would have run about 225 pages; see Roberts' Addendum, POxy, xviii. 107); (*h*) Hesychian.

(*a*) Mk $3^{2-3.\ 5}$; (*b*) 0213; (*c*) provenience unknown; (*d*) Sanz 32; (*e*) V/VI cent. ? ?; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) possibly Koine; (*i*) possibly from a lectionary.

(*a*) Mk 8^{33-37}; (*b*) 0214; (*c*) Soknopaiu Nesos

[2] It is to be understood that in some instances this assignment to a text-family is only tentative.

(Dîmeh); (*d*) Sanz 33; (*e*) IV cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian with occasional Koine variants.

(*a*) Mk $1^{20\text{-}21.\ 26\text{-}27}$; (*b*) 0215; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 34; (*e*) IV/V cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) closely related to B ℵ, though with occasional Koine variants.

(*a*) Jn $1^{26.\ 28.\ 49.\ 52}$ $2^{15.\ 16}$ $11^{40\text{-}52}$ $12^{25.\ 29.\ 31.\ 35}$ $17^{24\text{-}26}$ $18^{1\text{-}2.\ 16\text{-}17.\ 22}$ $21^{7.\ 12\text{-}13.\ 15.\ 17\text{-}20.\ 23}$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{59}$; (*c*) 'Auja-el-Hafir; (*d*) PColt 3; (*e*) VII/VIII cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) possibly Hesychian; (*i*) with *hermēneia* below text on each page.

(*a*) Jn $1^{31\text{-}33.\ 35\text{-}38}$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{55}$; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 35; (*e*) VI cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) closely related to B ℵ.

(*a*) Jn $8^{51\text{-}53}$ $9^{5\text{-}8}$; (*b*) 0216; (*c*) Soknopaiu Nesos (Dîmeh); (*d*) Sanz 36; (*e*) V cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) predominately Hesychian with two Tatianic readings.

(*a*) Jn 11^{57}–12^{7}; (*b*) 0217; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 37; (*e*) V cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian, yet differing from B.

(*a*) Jn $12^{2\text{-}3.\ 4\text{-}6.\ 9\text{-}11.\ 14\text{-}16}$; (*b*) 0218; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 38; (*e*) V cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian.

(*a*) Jn 16^{29}–19^{26} (with lacunae); (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{60}$; (*c*) 'Auja-el-Hafir; (*d*) PColt 4; (*e*) VII/VIII cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex (forty consecutive pages); (*h*) agrees chiefly with B ℵ; (*i*) with *hermēneia* below text on each page.

(*a*) Ac $1^{1.\ 4\text{-}5.\ 7.\ 10\text{-}11}$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{56}$; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 39; (*e*) VI cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) possibly Hesychian.

(*a*) Ac 4^{36}–$5^{2.\ 8\text{-}10}$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{57}$; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 40; (*e*) V cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian.

(*a*) Ac $7^{6\text{-}10.\ 13\text{-}18}$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{58}$; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 41; (*e*) V/VI cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian, with strong *I* influence.

(*a*) Ro $2^{21\text{-}23}$ $3^{8\text{-}9}$; (*b*) 0219; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 42; (*e*) IV/V cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian.

(*a*) Ro $5^{16\text{-}17.\ 19}$ 5^{21}–6^{4}; (*b*) 0221; (*c*) Soknopaiu Nesos (Dîmeh)?; (*d*) Sanz 43; (*e*) IV cent. (younger than codex Vaticanus, but older than codex Sinaiticus); (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) eclectic, possibly a local text from a time prior to the emergence of the main recensions.

(*a*) Ro $16^{23.\ 25\text{-}27}$, 1 Co $1^{1\text{-}2.\ 4.\ 6}$ $5^{1\text{-}3.\ 5\text{-}6.\ 9\text{-}13}$, Ph $3^{5\text{-}9.\ 12\text{-}16}$, Col $1^{3\text{-}7.\ 9\text{-}13}$ 4^{15}, 1 Th $1^{2\text{-}3}$, Tit $3^{1\text{-}5.\ 8\text{-}11.\ 14\text{-}15}$, Philem $4\text{-}7$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{61}$; (*c*) 'Auja-el-Hafir; (*d*) PColt 5; (*e*) VII/VIII cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) possibly Hesychian.

(*a*) 1 Co—see above, Ro 16^{23}, etc.

(*a*) 1 Co $9^{5\text{-}7.\ 10.\ 12\text{-}13}$; (*b*) 0222; (*c*) Soknopaiu Nesos (Dîmeh); (*d*) Sanz 44; (*e*) VI cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian, with one *I* reading.

(*a*) 2 Co 1^{17}–2^{2}; (*b*) 0223; (*c*) Soknopaiu Nesos (Dîmeh)?; (*d*) Sanz 45; (*e*) VI cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) miniature codex; (*h*) Hesychian, with some agreement with C; no certain agreement with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$.

(*a*) 2 Co $4^{5.\ 12\text{-}13}$; (*b*) 0224; (*c*) Soknopaiu Nesos (Dîmeh); (*d*) Sanz 46; (*e*) V/VI cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) no significant variants.

(*a*) 2 Co $5^{1\text{-}2.\ 8\text{-}9.\ 14\text{-}16.\ 19\text{-}21}$ $6^{1.\ 3\text{-}5}$ $8^{16\text{-}24}$; (*b*) 0225; (*c*) Hermopolis Magna (El-Ušmûnejm); (*d*) Sanz 47; (*e*) VI cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian, with special affinity for C and 33.

(*a*) Gal $1^{2\text{-}10.\ 13.\ 16\text{-}20}$; (*b*) $\mathfrak{P}^{51}$; (*c*) Oxyrhynchus; (*d*) POxy 2157; (*e*) IV cent.; (*f*) papyrus; (*g*) codex; (*h*) eclectic, closest affinity with B; never agrees with $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ except when latter supports B.

(*a*) Eph $6^{11\text{-}12}$; (*b*) 0230; (*c*) Antinoë; (*d*) PSI 1306; (*e*) IV/V cent.; but possibly earlier; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) without significant textual variants; (*i*) bilingual fragment with Latin [1] text of Eph $6^{5\text{-}6}$ on recto and Greek text of Eph $6^{11\text{-}12}$ on verso.

(*a*) Phil—see above, Ro 16^{23}, etc.

(*a*) Col—see above, Ro 16^{23}, etc.

(*a*) 1 Th—see above, Ro 16^{23}, etc.

(*a*) 1 Th 4^{16}–$5^{1\text{-}5}$; (*b*) 0226; (*c*) provenience unknown; (*d*) Sanz 48; (*e*) V cent. ? ?; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) Hesychian, related closely to B, but with a number of peculiarities.

(*a*) Tit—see above, Ro 16^{23}, etc.

(*a*) Philem—see above, Ro 16^{23}, etc.

(*a*) He $11^{18\text{-}19.\ 29}$; (*b*) 0227; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 49; (*e*) V cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) without significant variants.

(*a*) He $12^{19\text{-}21.\ 23\text{-}25}$; (*b*) 0228; (*c*) Fayyûm; (*d*) Sanz 50; (*e*) end of IV cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) non-Hesychian.

(*a*) 2 Jn $1\text{-}5.\ 6\text{-}9$; (*b*) 0232; (*c*) Antinoë; (*d*) PAntin 12; (*e*) not much later than middle of III cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) agrees with ℵAB; (*i*) editor conjectures that perhaps the codex contained a corpus of Johannine writings, with the Gospel, Revelation, and 1 John all preceding this fragment.

(*a*) Rev $18^{16\text{-}17}$ $19^{4\text{-}6}$; (*b*) 0229; (*c*) Antinoë; (*d*) PSI 1296 fol. *β*; (*e*) VII/VIII cent.; (*f*) parchment; (*g*) codex; (*h*) probably Hesychian.

In addition to listing these twenty-eight fragments, it will be of interest to examine some statistics. Nine of the fragments are written on papyrus, the remaining nineteen are on parchment. Whether papyrus or parchment, all alike are codices. Thus what has come to be acknowledged

[1] It is very rare to find a Latin fragment of the Scriptures in Egypt; on the knowledge of Latin by Christians in Egypt during the fourth century, see Gustav Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne*, i. [Paris, 1948], 143–146. Other fragments of the Bible in Latin from Egypt include 14 verses of Genesis (POxy 1073); 10 verses of Exodus (PSI 1272); 9 verses of Luke in a Gothic-Latin bilingual fragment (*ZNTW*, xi. [1910] 1–38); and 2 verses of John (PAberdeen 1). Cardinal Mercati suggests that the last is a fragment of a Latin Diatessaron, which antedates the famous Codex Fuldensis written for Bishop Victor of Capua in 541–546; see Mercati's extended note in PSI, xiii. i. 97–102.

as the prevailing preference among early Christians[1] is totally confirmed by the evidence supplied by these documents.

Furthermore, in the realm of textual criticism it is to be observed that the overwhelming majority of the fragments happen to belong to the Alexandrian or 'Hesychian'[2] type of text. According to the editors of the twenty-eight documents, three have no significant variant reading for establishing textual relationships, two have an eclectic type of text, one has a non-'Hesychian' form of text, two present a text which is possibly Koine, two others have a 'Hesychian' text with strong *I* influence, and all seventeen other manuscripts present a more or less 'Hesychian' type of text. In evaluating the significance of this prevailing 'Hesychian' complexion, perhaps one may conclude that, in view of the Egyptian provenience of most of the fragments, it is not surprising that most of them present an Alexandrian form of text. At the same time, however, the new evidence necessitates a modification of the opinion held by several scholars, that the early Egyptian text was prevailingly 'Western' in complexion.[3]

Furthermore, it is to be noted that three of the documents were found at 'Auja-el-Hafir in southern Palestine, about one hundred miles southeast of Jerusalem. Two of these (the Colt papyri containing Jn $1^{26ff.}$ and Ro $16^{23ff.}$) present a form of text which approaches the Alexandrian recension closer than any other form of text, and the third belongs quite unmistakably to this same recension. Indeed, this last-mentioned papyrus (PColt 4 containing forty consecutive pages of Jn 16^{29}–19^{26}) bears witness to the purest form of the Alexandrian recension, being closely related to the B ℵ group.[4]

The textual significance of these data may be summarized briefly as follows: The number of early witnesses to the Alexandrian type of text (formerly called the Neutral) has grown considerably. To the handful of manuscripts of the fourth to eighth centuries, which hitherto have been recognized as representatives of the 'Hesychian' recension, there must now be added about a score of other witnesses. It is true that the extent of text preserved to-day by many of these newly discovered documents is very limited indeed, but this circumstance does not reduce the number of such documents. Instead, therefore, of supposing that the Alexandrian family was a narrow and slender rivulet in the broad expanse of the transmission of the New Testament text, it is now seen that this text-family was widely prevalent in Egypt and, in fact, extended also to southern Palestine. Furthermore, a significant number of these recently published witnesses appear to agree with the earliest form of the Alexandrian type of text, namely, with what W. H. P. Hatch has recently designated as the Proto-Alexandrian text, hitherto represented only by $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$ in Acts and by B and ℵ in the New Testament as a whole.[5]

[1] See, *e.g.*, C. C. McCown, 'Codex and Roll in the New Testament,' *Harvard Theological Review*, xxxiv. [1941] 219–250; *ib.* 'The Earliest Christian Books,' *Biblical Archæologist*, vi. [1943] 21–31; and C. H. Roberts, 'The Christian Book and the Greek Papyri,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, l. [1949] 155–168. Strikingly enough, this general recognition that the early Christians made use of the codex-form receives added support from another quarter. On the basis of rabbinical usage, Saul Lieberman points out that 'an ancient injunction prohibited the publication in writing of the Oral Law. However, rabbinic sayings and decisions were written down in epistles, in private rolls and, above all, on πίνακες, codices (or single tablets which could subsequently be bound in a codex). . . . Now the Jewish disciples of Jesus, in accordance with the general rabbinic practice, wrote the sayings which their master pronounced *not* in the form of a book to be published, but as notes in their *pinaces*, codices, in their note-books (or in private small rolls). . . . In line with the foregoing we would naturally expect the *logia* of Jesus to be originally copied in codices' (*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* [New York, 1950] 204 f.).

[2] The designation 'Hesychian' (somewhat like the designation 'Western') appears to be a misnomer. Since 1894 when Bousset revived Hug's suggestion [1808] that Hesychius was responsible for that type of New Testament text of which the Codex Vaticanus (B) is the chief representative, this attribution has been widely accepted (*e.g.*, in the editions of von Soden, Nestle, Bover, Merk). Curiously, however, the popularity of this theory appears to be inversely proportionate to the amount of positive evidence in its favour; see Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, 'Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament,' *Mémorial Lagrange* [Paris, 1940], 245–250, who concludes, 'The title of "Hesychian" rests in fact upon what is little more than a shadow of a shade.'

[3] *E.g.*, Henry A. Sanders, 'The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts,' *Harvard Theological Review*, xxvi. [1933] 77–98.

[4] The validity of this judgment, expressed in 1941 by Kirsopp Lake on the basis of a preliminary transcript submitted to him by the editors of the Colt papyri and confirmed by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon on the basis of an examination of the finished edition, may be easily tested by any one who glances at the critical apparatus which Casson and Hettich supply (*op. cit.*, 95–111).

[5] William H. P. Hatch, *Facsimiles and Descriptions of Minuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament* [Cambridge, Mass., 1951], 60.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

'Your Temperature, Please?'

By the Reverend J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., London

'. . . fervent in spirit . . .'—Ro 12^{11}.

You see what I have here? Perhaps it looks a little mysterious so I'll take it out of its silver case. Let me give it one or two shakes to make quite sure that it is ready for use. Now let me see if this mercury is well below the mark.

Yes, it's a thermometer! And, of course, you will know what a thermometer is for? It's to take our temperature. (Or our 'tchemtchitcha' as my little neighbour used to say when she was just three years old!)

I wonder if you know what our temperature should be if we are quite well? I have a little red mark on this thermometer to tell me what a 'normal' temperature is. It says 98.4°. I think you must have heard the story of the little girl sitting on great-grandpa's knee. Every one that day was making a fuss of great-grandpa because it was his birthday and he was very old. 'How old are you?' asked little Mary. 'I be a 'undred and one to-day,' replied the old man. 'Don't be silly, great-grandad,' said Mary, 'that's not your age. A hundred and one is a temperature!' And so it is for most of us. But when it gets up there we've got to go to bed and take care of ourselves.

Now, this thermometer which I have in my hand is to measure the temperature of the human body. But there are other kinds of thermometers, you know. Some of you have seen the great big thermometers outside chemists' shops which give the temperature out of doors. Then, sometimes, there are thermometers on our church premises to give the temperatures in the various rooms. In a Baptist church in my home town a thermometer is hung just under the pulpit and the first thing the church secretary of two generations ago used to do on entering the church each Sunday morning was to march up to the pulpit like a sergeant-major, put his spectacles on the edge of his nose like a learned professor and proceed to read the thermometer. And if the reading was not just what it ought to be, the chapel-keeper could look out!

What I want to say, of course, is that there are other ways of measuring the temperature of our churches. I have known people enter a church on a hot June day and leave after the service complaining that it's a very 'cold' church, and that they'll never go there again. And I've known others go to a strange church on a cold February Sunday and describe the church as a 'warm' fellowship. Of course, they are not talking about the caretaker's stoking or anything like that. They are thinking of the warmth and cold made by people's hearts. They are thinking of Christian friendliness or the want of it. That's the real temperature of the church and it's something that can't be regulated by coal or electricity.

I wonder if the young people of this church are helping to make it a 'warm' fellowship by their hearty singing and above all by showing that the love of the Lord Jesus is in their hearts?

The Trials

By the Reverend J. H. Brown, M.A., B.D., Dunloy, Co. Antrim

'I am the good shepherd.'—Jn 10^{11}.

I wonder, girls and boys, have you ever been to sheep-dog trials? Not very far from where I live there are trials held every year and I decided to go and have a look. It was well worth while.

The field in which the trials were to be held was about forty acres in extent. The judges, the shepherds, and their dogs were at one end of the field, the sheep were enclosed at the other end. In the centre of the field there was an open gate, or at least what resembled an open gate. Near the bottom of the field there was a sheep-pen. Each dog was required to guide the sheep through the gate and then to drive them safely into the pen. The dog that did this in the shortest possible time stood the best chance of winning.

Some sheep had been loosed from their enclosure at the top of the field and were munching the grass contentedly in the open. Then came the signal for a shepherd to put his dog on trial—three words from the judge, 'Release the dog!'

Immediately the shepherd heard this his dog was sent careering away towards the sheep. Every dog without exception ran in a semicircle so as to approach the sheep from behind. As the dog ran nearer to the sheep it would shepherd them, running from side to side, with the customary skill of its kind.

Sometimes a dog, at a word of command or a whistle, would sink to the ground or would dart suddenly to one side of the sheep to challenge an

unruly member of the little flock. Obviously some of the dogs weren't so intelligent as others. But one thing they all had in common, and that was obedience to the voice of their master, the shepherd. For, as one of the shepherds said to me when I was talking to him, 'If the dog is to do the job at all he has to be obedient.' The best dogs were always those that responded best to the commands of the shepherd.

It was a great pleasure to watch the dogs at work. They were all mountain dogs, and the best of them had been at their job for years. When I heard of this it made me realize that the skill these dogs showed wasn't an accident. For a long time they had been training on the mountains for this day. It was on the mountains they learned to respond in such a remarkable way to the shepherd's voice, it was there they learned obedience to his will.

Girls and boys, I think all this is similar to what happens in your lives. You go to church and you go to Sunday school, and do you know the reason? Surely it must be clear to each one of us. So that there we might be trained to listen to the voice of the Shepherd, the Good Shepherd, who is Jesus Christ our Lord. So, girls and boys, let us take every opportunity we can of listening to that voice and let us try to obey it. For there are trials awaiting us. But if we have done our training well in church and Sunday school we need have no fear. We shall have learned to be courageous, to trust in God even although we can't see ahead very well, to be kind and considerate, honest and pure. At times we are tempted to think that going to church and to Sunday school don't matter, but they matter very much. For there we are trained to listen to the voice of the Shepherd, who is Jesus Christ our Lord.

The Christian Year

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Art of Living

BY PRINCIPAL H. F. LOVELL COCKS, M.A., D.D., BRISTOL

'For me to live is Christ.'—Ph 1^{21}.

Thomas Jefferson once said that the art of living is the art of avoiding pain. If he was right, then the Apostle Paul was a bungler. Paul never learned how to avoid pain. 'Of the Jews,' he says, 'five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness. . . .' And so he goes on with a catalogue of the pains and sorrows he has endured. And now he is in Rome, under house arrest and awaiting his trial before Nero. The fashionable philosophers of the city—the Stoics—would have agreed with Thomas Jefferson about the art of living. From their standpoint too the Apostle Paul was a bungler. They would have said that he had committed himself too far in accepting responsibility for other men's lives. He had allowed himself to be invaded by that strange mental perturbation called love, and had given his heart to dogs to tear. In his dealings with his churches he had deliberately put himself in the way of being hurt by malicious enemies and ungrateful friends. No real philosopher would have bothered with the foolish Galatians and the quarrelsome Corinthians. He would not have gone out of his way to get hurt—as Paul was always doing.

Now Paul knew all about this hermit-crab philosophy. He was quite well aware that in the eyes of its professors he was a fool. But he had his own very different philosophy which he sums up in our text. 'To me to live is Christ.' For Paul the art of living is not the art of avoiding pain. It is rather faith in Christ. Paul could have sung—as we sing—

> Thou, O Christ, art all I want,
> More than all in Thee I find.

For him the goal of all seeking is to find Christ. The art of all true living is to trust Christ, to serve Christ, to hide in Christ.

Let us look more closely at this faith-philosophy of the Apostle.

1. Paul tells us that Christ is the *purpose*, the meaning, of his life. It hadn't always been so. Nothing would have more outraged the brilliant young Pharisee, Saul of Tarsus, than to be told that one day he would rest all his hopes for this world and the next upon that same Jesus whose followers he was harrying from city to city. For in those days he thought that it was his religious duty to persecute the Christian disciples. In those days he would have said that what gave meaning and purpose to his life was his pure Hebrew descent, his profound knowledge of the Law of Moses, and his strict observance of its commandments. He was proud of these things, and we can understand why. In a world given over to idolatries and the immoralities that accompany them the tiny Jewish nation, divided and scattered though it was, had survived the fierce oppressions of its pagan masters and the still fiercer temptations to compromise with the lower standards and easier manners of the Gentile world, and had

preserved through all the purity and austerity of its ancient faith in God. This was no mean achievement and Saul would have been less than human if he had not been proud of belonging to the people of Israel. But when Christ met him on the road to Damascus, He turned Saul's world upside down. It wasn't that the Apostle ever came to regret his Jewish birth or to think lightly of his nation's history. To the end he treasured these things. But compared with the glory of knowing Christ, even these things no longer counted. 'What things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ.' What gives meaning to Paul's life is not that he was born a Jew, but that Christ has made him a new man. 'Yea verily,' he says, 'and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord.' 'For me to live is Christ.'

2. Then, too, Paul tells us that Christ is the *pattern* of his life.

Think of two friends whose lives are so closely linked by sympathy and understanding that they may even be said to have a common mind. Think of them as so completely attuned to one another that each knows and feels and judges in a particular situation as the other would know and feel and judge. But even this analogy breaks down when we are trying to portray the fellowship of the Christian with Christ. Paul seeks a communion with Christ so close that he can speak of being 'conformed' to Christ's death. He longs to be with Christ in the fellowship of Christ's sufferings —not because he has a morbid desire to suffer but because he wants to share with Christ in every experience. He speaks of being crucified to the world as Christ Himself was crucified to it. There is more here than a desire to repeat in his own life Christ's pattern of suffering. What Paul means is surely this—that because he wants to share Christ's mind and Christ's purposes, he wants to renounce what Christ renounced and so turns his back on the standards and values and prizes of the world. He did this when he suddenly left his Jewish friends and associations, among whom he was somebody of great importance and still greater promise, to become one of Christ's nobodies and the hard-worked missionary of an unpopular sect. Paul uses over and over again the phrase 'in Christ' to describe this life of sharing with his Master. He is not literally what he loves to call himself—Christ's slave. Paul is free with a largeness of liberty that has no parallel anywhere in the world outside of this relationship of the Christian to his Lord. Yet he is one with Christ in a union so complete that he can say, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'

3. 'I live, yet not I.' Paul tells us that Christ is the *power* of his life. If some Stoic philosopher had asked Paul why he undertook such arduous missionary journeys and laid himself open to slights and injuries from the people he was trying to serve, Paul would have replied in a sentence, 'The love of Christ constraineth me.' And Paul would have meant not so much that it was because he loved Christ that he was trying to serve his fellow-men, but rather that the love of Christ to him had become the driving power in his life.

Now, of course, judged by any standard the Apostle Paul was a very great man. He was, if you like, a genius. But, as we know only too well, the power of genius can work mightily for evil as well as for good. Everything turns on how it is guided. It needs to be disciplined if it is not to be wasted, and it needs to be directed to a worthy end if it is not to devastate mankind instead of blessing it. In Paul's case, Christ was at the controls. Yet Paul would have protested against being called a genius. He would have admitted, of course, that God gives to each one of us special endowments appropriate to the work He calls us to do for Him. But he would have insisted that over and above these special gifts is a power of living that is available to everybody who is willing to receive it. This power is the power of Christ's presence in our lives. Christ not only brings under control and guides our special talents and aptitudes, He also reinforces our weakness and sustains us in our weariness and disappointments. Paul prayed in vain to be delivered from his thorn in the flesh, but received the answer: 'My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness.'

4. Paul also tells us that Christ is the *prize* for which his race is run. 'Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect,' he says, 'but one thing I do: I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' Jesus, speaking to His disciples, called Himself the Way. Paul is still running in the Way which is Christ. Every step he takes, every experience through which he passes, every success, and every failure too—all these speak to him of Christ. Christ is in them all and in them all Paul finds Him and rejoices in Him. But what of the end of the Way? Death must come; and when it comes will it mean frustration or fulfilment? Paul gives an unhesitating answer to that question. 'To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.' For as life has meant Christ with us all the way, so death brings us into His nearer presence where the prize of prizes will be ours—an eternal communion with Him and fullness of life for evermore.

This is the open secret of the Christian religion. To all who are willing to receive Him Christ brings purpose and power for living. He does not promise that we shall be able to avoid pain;

what He promises is victory over pain, sin, death, and every evil. He does not promise us safety; what He does promise us is abundant life here and hereafter. And thousands upon thousands in every generation bear witness that Christ keeps His promises and rewards with His own strength and gracious presence all who put their trust in Him.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

St. Paul's Double Alibi

BY THE REVEREND JAMES WRIGHT, M.A., BOAT OF GARTEN

'It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.'—Ro 7^{20}.

'Not I, but Christ liveth in me.'—Gal 2^{20}.

1. When the Apostle acts basely he declines to admit that it was he who did it. He passes the blame on to 'sin,' an alien force which has invaded his life and seized his centres of power.

Every one is familiar with this human tendency to pass on the blame. The Bible finds this far from admirable, but very widespread, trait in the Mother and Father of us all, in Eve who blamed the serpent and in Adam who blamed 'the woman thou gavest me.' But we shall go far astray if we assume that here we have a man at the old game of deflecting the accusing finger. This is something deeper.

People often betray by their manner of speech that they agree with St. Paul in this matter, and do so when they are not trying to exculpate themselves. A man stricken with remorse for a wrong done to another, asking the other's forgiveness, may well say, 'I don't know how I came to do it.' 'I don't know what got into me.' 'I can't have been myself when I did it.' But more to the point, people frequently adopt this attitude when they are confronted with another's wrongdoing and no bias of self-excuse is at work. They will say, 'Whatever could have made him do that.' 'What possessed him to do it.' It would appear that the plain conscience of mankind agrees that when men are tempted, they are attacked by an evil power from outwith themselves and when they sin, they are overcome by it.

It is, of course, impossible to prove as it is to disprove the existence of such a demonic force in the world. When the saints in past centuries threw the ink-pot at the Devil there was nothing to be seen save the stains of the ink on the wall. No one can demonstrate scientifically that the gospel is right when it says of Judas, who betrayed his Master, that there was more than his own cupidity at work here, that indeed the Devil had entered into him. No one can prove by logical and conclusive argument that when Jesus agonized in the Garden of Gethsemane He was not wrestling simply with His own human dread of death, but was facing the last desperate effort of the powers of darkness to retain the mastery over men.

But if the Pauline and Biblical conviction that men are tempted and sin under pressure from an external and infernal force cannot be logically proved, it can be shown to be morally sound.

(1) *It disposes and helps us to be charitable to others*—not to condemn but to pity them—to regard them less as malefactors and more as victims. I once heard a man say that he would find it impossible to obey our Lord's command to forgive our enemies in the case of Hitler unless he believed that Hitler was possessed by and become the agent of a diabolic spirit. Surely there spoke an honest Christian. When Jesus on the Cross prayed for His murderers, 'Father forgive them! They know not what they do,' had He not in mind that His fellow-countrymen had all unwittingly suffered themselves to be used by the powers of darkness?

(2) *It involves regarding the higher self as the true self.* What Paul is claiming here is that when he acted shamefully, that was not the real Paul in action, but the real Paul in eclipse, that the real Paul would not stoop so low—and if any one had retorted that this real Paul was a fictional character, he would have retorted that instead he alone was genuine since he was the Paul in the heart and purpose of God. When we follow the Apostle in this matter, we are following Jesus who said of the Prodigal Son when he turned his back on the worthless fellow he had been and on the worthless life he had been leading, 'he came to himself.' When any one takes this point of view there follows a rise in self-respect and that for any prodigal means setting his face in the right direction.

2. And now to the Apostle's second alibi—'Not I, but Christ liveth in me.' If Paul declines to be saddled with the blame of his baseness, he equally disclaims the credit of his goodness.

It was impossible for one with his experience to think or say otherwise. He had been a Pharisee under the fanatical conviction that the Gentiles who knew not the Law and therefore could not observe it were alien to God—and almost beneath Paul's own contempt. But he became the Apostle to those Gentiles compassing sea and land, enduring hardships and daily risking his life to tell them that God so loved them that He sent His Son to die for them. How could he say other than that here was a different man—a new man—in whom Christ now dwelt and through whom Christ acted and spoke! It was as if a white South African, who all his life had voted and agitated that the only thing to be done in his country was to keep the black man down, were so to change his out-

look and behaviour that later he not only agitated and voted but lost his friends and was persecuted because he now felt the only thing to do was to lift the black man up. There could be no adequate explanation of that change—as of Paul's—but that now Christ lived in him, the Christ who came to 'make the fallen rise.'

If it is a power external to us which draws us to live wrongly, as surely it requires a power beyond ourselves to enable us to live rightly. A man with no experience or knowledge of business may exclaim that surely a business man should find it possible, almost natural, to see it as his duty to make his business a means of serving the hundreds of his employees and the thousands of his customers, rather than to use it mainly as a means to his own solitary advancement. But ask the business man! Many a one would retort that any man who talks like that is an airy idealist who knows nothing about human nature, nor about business nor about the world he is living in. And those who are in business and regard themselves as there not to be ministered unto but to minister would tell him they have only come to that because it is no more they that live but Christ that liveth in them.

It is having such an experience as makes us say, 'I didn't do that myself. I couldn't. It was Christ in me that did it,' which makes us Christians. And if so far we have never had anything in our lives which could only be explained by the victorious power of the Lord, He is still calling us across the Great Divide.

Paul's double alibi presents this picture of the human situation. We are like Britain in the days when she stood alone against Germany. Across the Channel was that mighty and evil power couched to invade and to degrade; across the Atlantic was America, the Arsenal of Democracy, ready to succour, strengthen, and equip; and the high problem of strategy was to keep the door closed against the one and open to the other. That is our position, and salvation depends on guarding the frontier of the soul against invasion from beneath even while we keep ourselves exposed to invasion from above.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Good or Clever?

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, SOUTH LUFFENHAM, RUTLAND

'But where shall wisdom be found? and where is the place of understanding?'—Job 28^{12}.

'Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.'—Job 28^{28}.

What is the connexion between knowledge and religion, between cleverness and goodness? This question presents itself sooner or later as we progress from the stage at which we accepted our religious beliefs, like the rules of arithmetic and spelling, from our parents and teachers. As we grow up we cannot go on believing our elders just because they are grown-up. We have the right to an opinion of our own, and as we exercise this right we find that other people had the same trouble as we had with the rules of spelling and arithmetic, but few of us would use our new-found freedom of judgment by setting aside these rules. The most we do is to forget them, and usually we do not go so far as that, for we find that everybody accepts these rules.

But with religion it is different. We find as we grow up that very considerable numbers of people do not accept the beliefs that we were taught as children. That is an unsettling discovery, especially when we notice that these unbelievers are by no means always notorious evil-doers. Among them are perfectly respectable people who move in our own social circle, who may even have been brought up in the same sort of religious homes as we ourselves. We should only be prigs if we thought ourselves any better than they are. More than that, they are often extremely clever people who use their brains and question religion in the name of reason. If you reason things out, they say, you cannot go on believing those things about God and Jesus Christ and His resurrection that you were taught as a child. Such beliefs must be put away with other childish things.

So it turns out that our religious beliefs, instead of having behind them the great solid body of all thinking people, as the rules of arithmetic have, are questioned and denied by many whose achievements justify their claim to cleverness. Perhaps we have not the time or the ability to follow closely the steps by which they reach their sceptical conclusions. And the less we investigate unbelief the more disquieting it becomes, like any other disquieting fact that we refuse to face. All these people, we tell ourselves, cannot be unbelievers for nothing. When they use their brains to such good effect in the world of invention, politics, literature, and art, surely they can claim to be heard in matters of religion. That is what we find so upsetting.

Knowledge and religion seem to be at enmity with each other. Should we frankly accept that opposition? We can see very well that knowledge does not always bring happiness, and if religion promises that, even promises eternal blessedness, why not stick to our old beliefs and never mind about knowledge? Some people try to do that, but it is not a satisfactory plan, for it is in the name of truth that religious beliefs are denied, and few of us would care to go on believing what we know to be untrue.

What are we to do about it ? We might note to begin with that there is no unanimity among the clever about religion or indeed about almost anything else. A very little newspaper reading and listening to the radio will convince us of this, and it is a conclusion that many perplexed people reached long before the days of newspapers or radio. This twenty-eighth chapter of the Book of Job shows us how a Hebrew poet of more than two thousand years ago looked at the matter. Where is wisdom to be found ? he asks. Even in those days there was a welter of opinions which puzzled the seeker after truth. The poet mentions the curious belief that perhaps, after all, the deepest wisdom is to be found in the lower animals whose instincts furnish them with so unerring a guide to the business of living. They do not need to reason things out, for they know by instinct all sorts of things that man can get at only by roundabout and laborious methods. But the poet does not accept that theory of the nature of wisdom. He knows how easily a survey of these conflicting kinds of knowledge breeds scepticism and makes men ask whether there is any such thing as truth, and whether wisdom has any meaning beyond man's ability to see what is to his immediate advantage and to devise the means for procuring it. That sceptical view he rejects. Man's quest for knowledge and the very difficulties and contradictions he meets in his search are indications of the all-understanding, all-creating mind of God who is the source of all wisdom. If you want to be wise, fear God ; and if you want to have understanding, depart from evil. Is that a satisfactory conclusion of the matter ? Would all those clever unbelievers see the point of it ? Is it not an abandonment of the quest for knowledge and wisdom ?

'Be good, sweet maid, and let who will be clever,' counselled Charles Kingsley, and it sounds a little like saying, 'To be clever is rather beyond your powers ; try being good, and in the end you will be better off.' Does that mean that goodness is more important than truth ? The seeker after truth would say that apart from truth goodness cannot really be good, and he would be right.

Another possible meaning of our text would be that if you fear God you will find a short-cut to the wisdom and knowledge that other people can reach only through much labour and toil. There again the seeker after truth would rightly disagree. It is simply not true that the pious man can automatically acquire the knowledge that costs his unbelieving brother such long hours of study and experiment to obtain.

No, the teaching of this Hebrew poet is deeper than that. He knows that you can leave God out of account and still learn much about the world that He has created, but he sees that if you leave God out of account you will not be really wise. And if you go so far as to take God into account but still stop short of giving Him worship and homage you show that you have not gone very far in the way of understanding God's relation to His creation, of which you are a part. You are not being reasonable. In other words, you cannot be reasonable without being good, and in fact this is what our second text says in effect—to depart from evil is understanding.

That is just one of those things that so many clever people overlook. To them the idea of sin is a very old-fashioned one, and if they have ceased to believe in the existence of sin then they will naturally be unaware of its power to corrupt the understanding and to paralyse the reason even in those matters which do not appear to be directly concerned with religion.

The ways in which sin corrupts the understanding are subtle and not always easily recognizable, but every now and then a striking example is forced on our attention. In our own time we have seen whole nations turning to the worship of the devil for his promise of the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. Their whole thought, in secular as well as in religious matters, has become corrupted. They have murdered and exiled seekers after truth and have committed themselves to the craziest theories of race and history.

One reason why the connexion between wisdom and the fear of God is not always obvious is that it is possible to acquire a great deal of knowledge about the world — scientific knowledge, artistic knowledge, political and historical knowledge— without taking God into account. But knowledge is not wisdom, and it is when this godless knowledge is applied to the business of living that trouble begins, for without the fear of God man has a distorted idea of his own nature, and so his whole life becomes out of joint.

Are wisdom and piety one and the same thing, then ? Not quite. There are many people who make a considerable show of piety and are more than a little silly. But the real saint, though he may be neither scientist, statesman, nor philosopher, is never a fool.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Judgment and Mercy in History

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., PINNER

'And when he [Jesus] was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, Saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace ! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that

thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side. And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee ; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another ; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought ; Saying unto them, It is written, My house is the house of prayer : but ye have made it a den of thieves. And he taught daily in the temple.'—Lk 19^{41-47}.

1. The fall of Jerusalem to the Roman army under Titus in the year A.D. 70 has frequently been used as a key to the date of the gospel writings. Simply stated, the argument runs thus : the Synoptic Gospels contain vivid predictions of the fall of the city ; these predictions must have been written by eye-witnesses after the event ; therefore all the Synoptic writings must be dated later than A.D. 70.

The passage before us now compels us to re-examine this argument since it contains one such prediction. And, in particular, it leads us to reconsider the second step in the argument. The hidden presupposition behind that step is that the fall of Jerusalem could not have been foreseen and foretold by Jesus forty years before the event. But why not ? Was the fall of a city so rare an event in ancient history as to be beyond imagination ? Was the known history of Jerusalem such that no one could dream of such a catastrophe ? Are we to think of Jesus as so politically ignorant that He could not read what He Himself called ' the signs of the times ' : the fanaticism of the Jews pitted against the world empire of Rome ? All these are general reasons which make it hard to believe that the fall of Jerusalem could not have been foretold.

But stronger than them is the particular situation of Jesus at this time. He goes up to Jerusalem to declare His Messiahship and establish His Kingdom. He goes in the spirit of one who knows that He will be rejected. Believing in His own Messiahship, and in His rejection at the hands of the Jews, what were His thoughts about the future of Israel ? What could He promise them except ' behold, your house is left unto you desolate ' ? The surprising thing would be to find Jesus holding any other idea about the future of His people. In all the circumstances the predictions of the end of the city are what we should expect.

And as we examine the passage we note that prediction and action form a unity. The cleansing of the Temple is the outward and visible sign of the end of Judaism. Our Lord believed that all that was now finished. Both as a nation and as a Church Israel had come to an end. Both as a nation and as a Church she was prophetic ; she proclaimed the Coming One, the Messiah, the Kingdom of God. But now the Messiah is here—unrecognized, unacceptable, rejected. In rejecting Him Israel has lost her *raison d'être*. All that awaits her in history is the judgment of God upon her infidelity.

2. Has all this to be read in a separate context—separate, that is, from the general history of mankind ? Surely if the Bible truly gives us a revelation of the action of God in history it is applicable to all periods of history. This is not to deny the specific revelation given to Israel. But as the unique revelation of humanity in Jesus Christ our Lord illuminates the nature of every man without ceasing to be unique, so the historic revelation in Israel which culminates in the Incarnation of our Lord illuminates every part of our human story. History is not merely the drama of the human will. It is the drama of the human will in relationship to the Divine will. Christ does not weep once only over Jerusalem. He weeps over the city of His rejection in every age. The predictions of the fall of Jerusalem are not exegetical problems for scholars, they are living words of judgment and of warning for the Christian preacher. We must heed them rather than argue about them.

In particular we must heed them to-day. And it is not sufficient in a mechanical, literalistic, or symbolic way to try to force the Scriptures to fit the pattern of twentieth-century history, or to find twentieth-century men and movements in the Scriptures. The truth is at once profounder and simpler.

It is that the meaning of every age is to be found in the spiritual purpose of God for that time, and not in ' the advance of civilization,' or ' the rise in the standard of living.' When we substitute some lesser material good for the spiritual progress which is God's will, we reject again His Christ and His Kingdom, and we set ourselves under His judgment. Our end becomes predictable.

We are aware of the Asiatic rejection of Christ. They have preferred Marx and dialectical materialism. We should be aware that that choice is one for which the European peoples have their measure of responsibility. If and when the African peoples embrace Communism our guilt will be still more obvious. But our own situation at home is the one to which we tend to be most blind. The crypto-materialism of the Western peoples, sheltering behind a screen of social idealism, is as ultimate a denial of Christ as is Marxism.

We have mass-produced a certain type of man. His values and his dreams are materialist. This is not only ' the salesman,' but the vast army of those whose emotional life is bounded by the fortunes of the Football League. How can the Divine purpose go forward in history by means of a society so completely divorced from spiritual reality ?

Pilate and Caiaphas represent the recurrent and contradictory dreams of humanity. Pilate—the world-state, the Pax Romana, order, justice, trade, and prosperity; Caiaphas—'my country and my people,' the chosen race, the nationalist dream. They shared the world in the first century, and they share the world now. They united in the rejection of Christ. They fell under the judgment of God.

3. Israel was judged as Church as well as nation. The Church must look to her own life in all this. The cry of Kirkegaard in his *Attack upon Christendom* is an unfulfilled prophecy. It will be fulfilled. The Church in her confusion with the world will share the judgment upon the world that in that winnowing the Church in her spiritual identity may be harvested. Not 'Israel after the flesh' but 'according to the Spirit' will be saved. The danger to 'Christendom' in our age is not Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao-tse-tung, or any other man or movement of that genre. It is far more subtle—far more insidious. Let me illustrate it from Thomas Merton's *Elected Silence*. He is talking about the chaplain in his public school.

'His greatest sermon was on the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians—and a very wonderful chapter indeed. But his exegesis was a bit strange. However, it was typical of him and, in a way, of his whole Church. His interpretation of the word "charity" in this passage was that it simply stood for "all that we mean when we call a chap a gentleman." In other words, charity meant good-sportsmanship, cricket, the decent thing, wearing the right kind of clothes, using the proper spoon, not being a cad or a bounder.

'There he stood in the plain pulpit, and raised his chin above the heads of all the rows of boys in black coats, and said, "One might go through this chapter of St. Paul and simply substitute the word 'gentleman' for 'charity' wherever it occurs. If I talk with the tongues of men and of angels and be not a gentleman, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling symbol. . . . A gentleman is patient, is kind; a gentleman envieth not, is not puffed up . . . a gentleman never falleth away."'

And so St. Paul is massacred to make a Public School holiday.

The Church—the true Church—is entrusted with the gospel of Jesus Christ. That gospel has as its centre the Passion and the Resurrection of our Lord. There God leans upon history. From there His purpose goes forward. It is a purpose of redemption and regeneration—the redemption and the regeneration of each human soul.

What has the Church to say? What the Church has always said, 'Ye must be born again.' The future of humanity is always the future of redeemed humanity. Unredeemed humanity has no future because it stands under Divine judgment.

His 'voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: For our God is a consuming fire.'

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Fullness of Christ

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE T. H. REID, M.C., B.D., GLASGOW

'Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias.'—Mt 16^{14}.

'Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?', Jesus asked His men. And they said, 'Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some Elias; and others, Jeremias.' These views seem very curious to us. But there it is—that is the way the people who heard Jesus speak, and saw Him in the flesh, had begun to think and speak of Him.

Let us see how such odd opinions ever arose. However did they think of Jesus in terms of the dead Baptist, and the still more anciently dead Elijah or Jeremiah?

This is not the first time we have heard this identification of Jesus with John. You remember how Herod trembled behind his ramparts when he heard of the growing power of Jesus. It is probable that Herod had already heard some rumour of the popular view that Jesus was John returned in greater power than ever, and his fear enlarged it. It is possible there was some physical resemblance between Jesus and John, for they were cousins. However this may be, there certainly was an obvious similarity in their messages when Jesus began to preach. Matthew sums up the Baptist's preaching in a few words: 'Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Then a few verses later, when John was imprisoned by Herod, he tells us that Jesus began to preach and to say, 'Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' The fact that Jesus proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom as good news and that John proclaimed it as a warning and a threat, would not likely be appreciated at the time. There was some reason for the people's view that Jesus was John returned with greater power.

There was a reason also for the view that He was Elijah. The last words of the Book of Malachi are: 'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.' These words had given rise to the expectation that Elijah,

who according to tradition had been carried up to heaven by a whirlwind, would return to prepare the people on the eve of the longed-for day of God's redemption.

There was a reason of the same sort for the view that He was Jeremiah. In the Second Book of the Maccabees, a book included in Jewish Scriptures and read by Jesus' contemporaries, we are told how on the invasion of the Assyrian armies Jeremiah hid the sacred ark, and how he promised its hiding-place would remain unknown 'until God gather the people again together, and mercy come.' So both Elijah and Jeremiah came to be associated with the coming day of God's power and glory. But more important than the reasons for these opinions are the truths that they suggest.

1. First of all they suggest a sense of His greatness. The significant thing is that the people had come to think of Jesus in one or other of these terms. Men don't regard a contemporary as the reincarnation of their great national and historical heroes without being profoundly impressed by him. In thinking of Jesus as John the Baptist or Elijah, or Jeremiah, they were placing Him in the highest category of which they could think.

Now, of course, that sense of greatness has been amply confirmed by the judgment of subsequent history. Emerson was not an orthodox Christian, but it was he who acknowledged the manifest fact that, since the momentous days in Galilee, the name of Jesus 'is not so much written as ploughed into the history of the world.' It was just ten years ago, when Hitler was at the height of his triumphs, Mussolini was enjoying the fruits of his jackal policy, and Stalin was looking on hopefully from the side, while the rest of Europe was in convulsions, that the late Field-Marshal Smuts, perhaps the greatest prophet-statesman of our day, declared: 'In the twilight of to-day I see on the human horizon, not the man of Moscow, the man of Munich, the man of Rome, but the Man of Galilee. The Man of Galilee is and remains our one and only leader.'

2. Then, again, these contemporary views of Jesus suggest a sense of His supernaturalness. There was a greatness defying rational explanation; a greatness inherently mysterious. The sense of supernaturalness in Jesus has also been confirmed by History. There is something about Him that men recognize places Him in a category by Himself. You remember Carlyle's acknowledgment of this fact in his lectures on Heroes. He had chosen a great and imposing array of the great to write about—Muhammad, and Dante; Luther, and Napoleon; and many others. 'But,' he says, 'the greatest of all heroes is One—whom we do not name here. Let sacred silence meditate that sacred matter.'

Of course, on the other hand, there are those who in every age have discounted the idea of the supernaturalness of Jesus. Well, such a point of view is difficult to refute. How can you prove the supernaturalness of anything? There is, of course, the fact that over a period of twenty centuries many of the finest spirits and minds have worshipped Him. In a rational world real effects follow real causes. At least there must have been something extraordinary in Jesus to produce this extraordinary effect. But the only assurance of His supernaturalness is in getting to know the Figure around which the gospel story is written. The more you study it, the more you will find, apart from the stories of the miracles altogether, something in the Person of Jesus Himself quite irreducibly mysterious.

Mrs. Ward recounts a conversation she had with Walter Pater in which she was repeating the cant of the day, predicting that the new knowledge would drive the Christian Faith from the field before the twentieth century was fairly begun. 'I don't know,' Walter Pater replied: then added hesitantly, 'We don't altogether agree. You think it plain, but I can't. There are such mysterious things. Take that saying: "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden"—how can you explain that? There's mystery in it. Something supernatural.'

It is a significant thing that while a common heresy to-day is the belief that Jesus was only a man, the first heresy that arose soon after He ceased to walk the earth was that He was not a man at all, but a Divine phantom created by God. In His own day His contemporaries, who watched Him and heard Him, had a sense of the mysterious. 'Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias.' The common factor in these different views is that they all regard Jesus as supernatural.

3. Again, these contemporary views of Jesus together suggest some sense of His fullness. The famous figures associated in the popular mind with Jesus, represent an extraordinary variety of character. John was the inflexible prophet of repentance. Elijah was one of the most mysterious figures of the Bible, coming and going as elusive as the wind, yet ever arriving at the critical moment, the austere defender of the Faith of Israel, the champion of social righteousness. Jeremiah, again, is completely different. He stands out in the Old Testament as perhaps its greatest and most sensitive soul; tortured by the sins and miseries of his time. It is a remarkable thing that there were those among His contemporaries who saw each of these strongly contrasted types in Jesus. And, of course, there is that in Jesus which justifies each view.

It is a natural tendency for us to see in great

men the virtues we ourselves most admire. I heard of a Japanese commander who, given a New Testament, handed it back after he read it with the remark : ' Your Jesus was the bravest man I have read of.' An article written in *Life and Work* some months ago told us what first captured the interest and admiration of a young man for Christ. It was something that would not occur to most of us, but there it is ; it first attracted him—the fact that One so constantly on the march must have been tremendously fit.

And it is all true. It is the effect of the richness of His nature that different men see such different qualities to admire in Him. The young may find in Him their leader, the old their refuge and their strength, the soldier may see in Him the supreme commander, the man of peace the good shepherd for his life. The social reformer may find in Him the greatest of all revolutionaries ; the worker, the Carpenter of Nazareth, who by His toil has hallowed all common work. So men in His day saw John the Baptist ; others Elijah ; others Jeremiah in Him. For such in Paul's phrase is the ' fullness of Christ.'

4. These contemporary views do suggest a sense of timelessness. It is really rather odd that some folk of His day could think of Him in terms of one who had just been martyred ; others in terms of one who had died six centuries before ; and still others, in terms of one who had died two and a half centuries before that again. For them the ages are as different as those between Winston Churchill, Robert the Bruce, and William the Conqueror are for us. There was a certain timeless quality about Jesus so that it did not seem incongruous for the people of His day to think of Him as a contemporary, or as one of an age six centuries before, or of an age eight hundred and fifty years before their day.

Partly this is due to the fact that John, Elijah, and Jeremiah were heralds of eternal and timeless truths ; Elijah's summons to the people of his day to decision, Jeremiah's call to the people of his time to a personal and spiritual relationship with God, and John's summons to repent, are not relevant to any single age alone, but are for every generation. They are all gathered up in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

A sense of greatness, a sense of supernaturalness, the sense of a fullness and of a timelessness—these truths seem to be suggested by the views of Jesus' contemporaries. And all that vague sense of mystery and wonder no doubt lay heavily upon the disciples' minds, until the question was turned upon themselves : ' Whom say ye that I am ? ' And then at last the lightning flashed, and the thunder rolled out in Peter's great confession : ' Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.'

Contributions and Comments

The Church and the Ministry

In The Expository Times, lxiii. 228 [April, 1952], is Dr. Maclagan not mistaken in attributing the remark about Ordination to Cunningham ? In Duncan's *Colloquia Peripatetica*, 75, there is the following saying :

' It is strange that all Christendom becomes Presbyterian on an ordination day.'

John McKenzie

Edinburgh

The Cleansing of the Temple

Why did the author of St. John's Gospel place the account of the Cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of our Lord's ministry, and not at the end like St. Mark ? What would seem to tell in Mark's favour is that there is no echo of this challenge to the authorities which this incident must have provoked before the trials of Jesus. Other challenges, such as healing on the Sabbath and consorting with sinners, were constantly on the minds and lips of His enemies. Might I hazard the suggestion that in the Fourth Gospel we have a digression dealing with signs ? In all probability the recollection of a sermon of St. John by the disciple who wrote the Gospel. To have described the Cleansing of the Temple in its normal position would have interfered with the plan the writer had in mind. The event which really decided the Sanhedrin to get rid of Jesus was not the Cleansing of the Temple, as suggested by St. Mark, but the seventh sign of the Gospel—the raising of Lazarus from the dead. The growing popularity which this gave to our Lord, coupled with the news which had reached the Sanhedrin that foreigners like the Greeks were joining His ranks, aroused their alarm. In view of the approach of the Passover some spark might set a rebellion ablaze giving the Romans excuse for disastrous action. Under such a threat Caiaphas outlined his policy. ' It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.'

But if the Cleansing of the Temple could not be

included in its rightful place, it was important enough to be inserted, and what better position than after the first sign as he had heard John do in a discourse about signs? After the miracle of Turning Water into Wine, which produced faith in the Master, He retired quietly to Capernaum for a few days lest His disciples and relatives should attach too much importance to the sign. The Cleansing of the Temple followed all the signs. But even the raising of Lazarus had not convinced the Pharisees. It had only provoked them to devise a plan for the death of One they regarded as an impostor and dangerous to the community. The Triumphal Entry and the Cleansing of the Temple are a final effort to open the eyes of those who ought to have recognized the signs of their Messiah when He came. But no, they are still asking for signs. 'What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?' Jesus gives them a sign. The raising of Lazarus had not been a sufficient sign to convince them, therefore He would offer the greatest proof possible. He Himself would submit to be killed and come to life again. 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' Even the disciples did not believe this sign until it was fulfilled. Others beside Thomas had to see in order to believe in the resurrection of Jesus. 'When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.' Signs had their limited value even for the disciples and were useless to disbelievers. As for the crowds, they professed belief in Jesus because of His miracles, especially after He had raised Lazarus from the dead. This kind of faith as Jesus well knew was untrustworthy. 'Jesus did not commit himself unto them.' Shortly they would be crying 'Crucify.' Signs are only second best. 'Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.'

Though placed early in the Gospel by the writer, the whole atmosphere surrounding the Cleansing of the Temple seems to reflect the feelings of men coincident with the time of the event as reported by St. Mark. Therefore the position in this Gospel is not that of its historic order but to serve a didactic purpose.

F. A. Cooke

Audenshaw, Manchester

A Simple Solution of Nehemiah iv. 23 (Heb. verse 17)

שִׁלְחוֹ הַמַּיִם

From pre-Christian times unto the present day these two words have presented to translators an insoluble problem. The Septuagint gave them up in despair and prudently omitted them (א, B, A). The Lucianic text gives a doublet: 'and the one whom they sent for water, a man and his missile to the water.' The Vulgate has: 'Only each one was stripped for baptism.' The R.V. declares: 'the text is probably faulty.'

A.V. reads 'put them off for washing.'; R.V. 'went with his weapon to the water.' Each has added several words to complete the sentence, and neither agrees with the context or yields a reasonable sense. Moreover in the A.V. 'put off' is used for two different words, in the Hebrew (שָׁלַח, פָּשַׁט) which are certainly not synonyms. Later translations are no more successful in solving the problem: on the contrary, 'the rent is made worse.' Thus the *New American Translation* [1927] changes הַמַּיִם into בְּיָדוֹ or בִּימִינוֹ, a more violent departure from the Massoretic text, with no improvement in the sense.

The solution I suggest is a simple one: read שִׁלּוּחַ or שִׁלַּח for שִׁלְחוֹ. The ancient mistake of adding or displacing ו among three similar letters, ה, ו, ח, is very possible and probable, and has caused all the trouble. שִׁלַּח הַמָּיִם will then mean 'at the discharge of the waters,' or Siloam, the form in which the two words appear in LXX, New Testament, Josephus, etc. This form retains the *order* of the two words in Nehemiah; not 'the waters of Shiloah' but 'the Shiloah of the waters.'

Siloam was and is the customary place for washing clothes; but owing to the danger of a vigilant enemy it was impossible for the armed workmen to do this during the day, and at night the men were ordered to retire within the walls of the city (see previous verse), Siloam being outside.

There is no objection to this solution on the ground of syntax. The two words are not in apposition, but שִׁלַּח is in the construct state, and has therefore no article.

H. J. Warner

Poole, Dorset

Entre Nous

Religious Education: Teaching the Miracle Stories of the Bible

Three principles may be suggested to guide our thinking and to provide us with a goal of adult understanding towards which our teaching may be directed. Discussion of their application will be confined to illustrations from the Gospels, since Mr. Gray's article in the last number dealt with parallel problems in Old Testament teaching.

In the first place it must be recognized that we cannot measure the credibility of Biblical miracles by scientific standards. Science studies the created universe but the Bible tells us about the Creator. We cannot limit God's action by the partially apprehended laws operative in His own universe. We need not, therefore, doubt the historicity of a Biblical miracle merely because it is scientifically incredible. Any attempt to distinguish between the healing and the nature miracles of Jesus on these grounds is theologically indefensible.

It must be equally clearly recognized, however, that the Biblical record is subject to the ordinary limitations of human evidence. The Old Testament historians used uncritically such oral and written traditions and records as were available in their day to show how God had dealt with His people Israel. Detailed historical accuracy did not interest them. The wonder of God's deliverance was equally great whether He had 'caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind' or divided the waters at the raising of Moses' rod. The miracle is in the fact of the deliverance not in the legendary elements of the Exodus narrative.

Even the evangelists were not scientific historians. They were men with a message. Their interpretation of events was determined by their faith and it was coloured by the knowledge and outlook of their times. The 'mighty works' of the Messiah are an inseparable part of the gospel tradition but the interpretation of the stampede of the Gadarene swine may well be due to contemporary presuppositions in the minds of the eyewitnesses. The fact of miracle is central for Christian belief, but the historicity of individual miracles is a matter on which considerable variation of opinion is natural and permissible.

The third principle directs attention to the real criterion which should guide our judgment on the miracle stories of the Bible. That criterion is neither scientific nor, ultimately, historical but theological. We do not reject a Biblical story because it is scientifically inexplicable. Historical and literary evidence is relevant and important, but even it is not finally determinative. The ultimate criterion must be the congruity of the event described with the total Biblical revelation of the power and love of God. The miracle of the Resurrection is an inseparable part of that revelation but the blasting of the fig-tree seems quite incongruous with it.

It is sometimes said that no problem arises in teaching miracle stories to young children since they accept the wonder element simply and uncritically. There is a dangerous fallacy in this position since a wrong emphasis in early years creates unnecessary difficulties in later childhood and adolescence. Young children have a natural capacity for wonder which should be nourished and developed. But it should be associated with the right elements in the story. The nativity stories are beloved by all little children and should be told and retold in all their beauty. But the real object of awe and wonder is surely the Baby of whom such stories were told rather than the wondrous details of the stories themselves. The real miracle is to be found in the Birth and not in the star or the angels. If children learn to think of the Birth stories from earliest years as 'stories that are told about what happened on the night when Jesus was born' there is less danger of the Birth, as well as the star, being assigned to the category of poetry and imagination when boys and girls gradually separate out their knowledge and experience into appropriate categories.

The matter-of-fact junior is less susceptible to wonder and more apt to ask 'How could Jesus walk on water?' It is important, therefore, that interest be focussed on the significance of such an experience for the disciples, and for the evangelists, rather than on the physical marvel of the recorded incident. Comparison of the synoptic and the Fourth Gospel records will show an intelligent adolescent that the incident was remembered as an illustration of a truth tested and proved many times, no doubt, in the experience of the Early Church. The Gospel writers knew that nothing could keep Christ from them in their hour of need and that, when they were willing to receive Him into the boat of life, 'the wind ceased' and they found themselves at their 'desired haven.' Young children can grasp this truth if it is given to them through an imaginary conversation between the disciples as they looked back on the events of that night—as the evangelists did—after many years of Christian experience. But even without using such a device we can focus attention on the joy of the disciples and their release from fear—like a young child escaping from the fears of a nightmare when his mother comes to him. Above all, we can refrain from using a picture of the incident!

The story of Jairus's daughter illustrates a similar point. The deepest truth of this story does not lie in the physical marvel but in the victory over death that Christ offers to all men. St. John brings this truth out very clearly in his account of the raising of Lazarus. 'I am the resurrection and the life.' We cannot give this adult teaching to children but we can guide their thoughts towards it by focussing attention on the words of Jesus to Jairus and to the professional mourners. Trust and not fear or wailing is the appropriate attitude even in the face of death for those who know that they live in their Father's world.

In the critical years when questions are crystallizing but the mind is not ready for adult discussion

of the problem every effort should be made to present the gospel narrative as a whole and to fill out the picture with background detail. In this way we focus attention on the Person of Christ as a real figure of history. The problem of miracle looms less large when it is seen as an element in a total picture of One who lived within history and whose life changed the course of history. Stories from the life of the Church in earlier centuries and in modern times have an important contribution to make also, for they show that the supernatural life which was in Christ is still at work in the lives of His followers 'moving mountains' of ignorance, apathy, and evil by miracles of Divine grace.

J. W. D. Smith

Jordanhill, College, Glasgow

Servants of the Entrusted Word

A recent letter from a former student has in it these words, 'One of these days I am hoping to preach a good sermon.' It is precisely to help preachers to fulfil that very proper ambition that all Warrack Lectures were ever written. Usually the Warrack Lectures are delivered by preachers who rank as seniors in the Church, but the latest series was delivered by the Rev. David H. C. Read, who is still a young man, but the amount of experience which he has packed into life gives him a right to speak. Now Chaplain to Edinburgh University, he formerly held two parishes and also had the deepening experience of a prison camp during the days of the War. He has chosen as his title *The Communication of the Gospel* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). 'Every creative encounter in society involves the mysterious trinity of thought, expression, and communication.' At the present time communication has broken down and the problem is to bridge 'the expanding gulf between the thought and language of the inner Church and those of the contemporary world.' And it is not easy to find means of communication with 'these people for whom Genesis is a biological term and Revelation the name of a suitcase.' Mr. Read distinguishes two heresies. One he calls the Western Heresy. Its emphasis is on activity, organization, and technique. 'Techniques of preaching, techniques of visiting, techniques of personal counselling —learn what you can from them, but hold them at arm's length, remembering the warning slogan of our friends in the medical profession faced with a similar threat: Operation successful; patient dead.' Mr. Read surmises that the priest and the Levite may well have scurried past the wounded traveller on the Jericho road because they had 'an urgent appointment to attend the Committee for the Relief of Distressed Travellers.' The second heresy Mr. Read calls the Continental Heresy. Its characteristic is that it considers its sole duty to be to present the Word to its hearers and to leave the rest to God in the most absolute way.

Mr. Read detests the modern habit of pulpit diagnosis. 'Diagnosis is the endemic disease of modern preaching.' 'Our chief task as preachers is to be announcers of good news, not midwives of calamity.' The very fact of diagnosis detaches a man from the scene which he is diagnosing. Mr. Read has a most telling illustration of this. 'In P.O.W. camps during the War we spent a lot of time in diagnosing the War situation. Contrary to popular belief we were extremely well-informed on current events; for we combed the German papers, heard their radio, heard the B.B.C. on secret sets, had first-hand accounts of actions from recent captives—and had hours of leisure to draw conclusions and form opinions. When an occasional airman from the thick of the battle was shot down near our camps and appeared like an angel from home, we invariably found that compared with the camp pundits he was almost totally ignorant of the War-situation.' The man in the midst of the battle cannot detach himself to diagnose.

Mr. Read believes intensely that the Christian must be in the world but not of it. He sees in the Incarnation that which indeed links together these two apparent incompatibles. To that end he believes that a preacher should 'be reading the books and poems, seeing the plays and films and paintings, hearing the music of the present day to the limit of his natural capacity.' He is 'the servant of the entrusted word,' and he must make it relevant.

For this certain things are necessary. It is a prime necessity that the Word should be preached in words people can understand. Preaching must be accompanied by the Sacraments because they have a 'constancy denied to human speech.' The significance of Scripture is decisive and a sermon should start from 'a text and not a pretext.' And the whole must be interpreted by the action and influence of the Holy Spirit.

It is difficult to give an adequate impression of this book. There are few hints for definite sermons here, but there is a quite invaluable assessment of the modern situation and of the principles wherewith to meet it, an assessment made by one who has an acute mind and a gift for vivid expression.

William Barclay

Glasgow

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION
FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA in THEOLOGY

At the London University B.D.
(External) Examination 1951

28

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS PASSED
including 3 of the 4
FIRST-CLASS HONOURS MEN

Prospectus Free
on request (mentioning examination) to
C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 4,

WOLSEY HALL
OXFORD

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your PRINTING and PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

THE LOCAL COLOUR OF THE BIBLE

By the Rev. CHARLES W. BUDDEN, M.D., and the Rev. EDWARD HASTINGS, D.D.

Complete in Three Volumes.

Price **11s.** net each

Vol. I.—Genesis to II. Samuel
Vol. II.—I. Kings to Malachi
Vol. III.—The New Testament

To understand the Bible clearly it must be read with the light of the East upon it. These volumes illuminate the text of the Bible by giving facts dealing with the manners and customs of its times; with the Geography and History required to focus them, the whole being grouped under the generic title of 'Local Colour,' *i.e.* The Oriental setting or background.

Each Biblical book is divided into sections dealing each with a definite episode in Hebrew history, and all in a form which can be used most readily by preachers and teachers.

'A wealth of valuable information put in the clearest and most readable form.'—
London Quarterly Review.

'Delights and informs the reader.'—
Life and Work.

T. & T. CLARK 38 GEORGE STREET EDINBURGH, 2

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.*

TWO REPRESENTATIVE TESTIMONIALS TO THE 'ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS'

'The *Encyclopædia* by its unprecedented comprehensiveness, its remarkable co-ordination of historical, philosophical and religious learning, and its patient grouping of comparative material, stands alone upon a very high eminence in the book world.

'To have it upon one's shelves is to be subjected to a continual temptation to stray far from one's immediate field into fascinating bypaths of study, and to be compelled in a thousand unexpected directions to enlarge one's outlook upon the wide province of religious experience and experiment and conviction.'

Rev. W. A. CURTIS, D.D., D.Litt., D.Theol.

'I would emphasize just two points for the consideration of the working minister who wishes to be efficiently equipped for his responsible task as a preacher in these days.

'The first is this. In our time a minister who would win and keep the attention of thinking men must be furnished with knowledge far beyond what was requisite a generation ago, for popular knowledge has increased and questionings abound. In particular the study of religions has become of first-rate importance, and the preacher must have, not vague notions, but clear views of non-Christian faiths. So too, perhaps in less degree, with philosophies and speculations that are related by friendliness or hostility to Christian belief. If the minister have not such knowledge in his head, he must have ready access to it as occasion requires. Here in *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* lie all the necessary materials to hand ready for use. Further, the light here cast upon the Christian Verities is incalculable. Hundreds of texts are given deeper significance. Points, illustrations and enforcements are here for a lifetime's preaching, and, unlike some of the familiar and fallacious illustrations of our early days, those culled from this work may all be taken as absolutely trustworthy, guaranteed by the highest known authority.

'My second point is this. The *E.R.E.* is a whole library, and is the cheapest library one can secure. It gives the substance of many volumes that are scarce and costly. Of many single articles it is true that they make unnecessary the purchase of a shelf-ful of books. I would advise all theological students to devote their preaching fees to secure this splendid equipment for their life-task. To congregations that are thinking of giving their minister a really good present, I would suggest that they could give nothing so useful as a set of *E.R.E.*, if he is not fortunate enough to possess it already.'

Rev. Professor W. D. NIVEN, D.D., GLASGOW UNIVERSITY.

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.* *Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2.

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*